

Videoconferencing

Interpreters

Trial Presentation

Videography | Copying and Scanning

Court Reporting

PROPOSED CLEANUP ACTIONS FOR REMEDIATION OF HANFORD WASTE SITES
CONTAMINATED WITH PLUTONIUM AND CESIUM



MEETING
Wednesday, July 27, 2011
Portland State University
Smith Memorial Student Union, Vanport Room 338
Portland, Oregon

VOLUME IV

REPORTED BY: Kimberly McLain, Court Reporter

1	VOLUME IV
2	MEETING
3	Wednesday, July 27, 2011
4	7:00 p.m.
5	
6	MR. NILES: Good evening, everybody. Boy,
7	there was even a little hush there, kind of my cue.
8	Thank you all for coming on a beautiful summer
9	night.
10	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do you have a mic?
11	MR. NILES: Are we doing better now?
12	AUDIENCE: Yeah.
13	MR. NILES: Can the back of the room hear
14	me all right?
15	AUDIENCE MEMBER: We need to quiet down.
16	MR. NILES: Can the back of the room hear
17	us all right? Yes? Just barely? Do you want to
18	turn that up or do you want me to move that up?
19	Okay. We're good. Thank you, everybody, for
20	coming, especially on a gorgeous summer night like
21	this. Appreciate the turn out that we consistently
22	see in Portland that you come out and offer your
23	opinion on the Hanford cleanup. My name is Ken
24	Niles. I work for the State of Oregon. I head up
25	the State of Oregon's oversight of the Hanford

cleanup. I'm playing a different role tonight. I've been asked to moderate the meeting so that's mostly the role I'll be playing, although I will step out, briefly, a little bit from that role just to offer you some comments on behalf of the State of Oregon. We're going to try to stick to our schedule. We've had some difficulties in doing that. But all of us as speakers can try and be concise and get the message to you so we can get to the question and answer period and get to the formal comment period as well. So that's what we're going to do at least from our aspect is try and do that.

We are here tonight to talk about -- and I'd like to just spend a moment, just kind of break it down for you a little bit because Hanford gets so big and so complicated and all of us are going to try and make this make sense to you. But we're talking tonight about 21 different waste sites at Hanford. And the formal name for those falls into the CW-5 PW-1, 3 and 6 operable units. And that makes no sense to anybody and it's not important that you understand what the differences are between the PW group and the CW group. We're going to give you a little bit of background on what that means. But I think from your standpoint, what's important

to know is there's -- we're talking tonight about really six different groupings of similar waste sites. One of them which is -- and all of them received liquid contaminated waste.

So there's one group of waste sites called the Z-Ditches that the Department of Energy and its regulators are proposing to dig up. There's some plutonium -- other plutonium contaminated sites called the Low-Salt waste group that the Department of Energy is proposing to dig up. There's some pipelines they are proposing to dig up. There's some tanks they are proposing to empty which, from our perspective, is a really good thing all those things. What I think you'll find more interesting is the discussion that's going to talk about the remaining two sets of waste sites.

One is three waste sites of plutonium contaminated waste called the High-Salt waste group and the other is five waste sites contaminated with cesium, called the Cesium waste site. So the Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency, our speakers tonight, are going to explain a little bit more about those. That's really how it all breaks down in terms of what we're talking about tonight.

1	One quick thing, just kind of a
2	housekeeping, if you will, I noticed at the end of
3	the meeting, Gerry asked people how you were
4	notified, how you found out about the meetings.
5	There is a form as well at the desk that we'd
6	appreciate if you could fill it out that asks some
7	of those same questions and gives, as well, other
8	feedback about this meeting. I know there's been a
9	desire when we come to Portland to try and find the
10	right places. Some of the hotels get very
11	expensive. Sometimes there's issues with parking
12	there. We know there's issues, potentially, with
13	parking here at PSU. So, you know, if there's
14	places you like, if this doesn't work for whatever
15	reason, you know, if you would give your feedback in
16	writing it would be very helpful for us.
17	So with that, let's move on to our first
18	speaker is the Assistant Manager for the Central
19	Plateau for the U.S. Department of Energy's Richland
20	office is J.D. Dowell.
21	MR. DOWELL: Can everybody hear me? Is
22	that good?
23	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Would you spell your
24	last name please.
25	MR. DOWELL: J.D. Dowell. D-o-w-e-l-l. I

1	can give you a card as well. I want to reiterate
2	what Ken, and Gerry, also said at the end of his
3	brief presentation, and that is that we are here for
4	public involvement. We're here to hear your
5	comments and you have to understand that our view
6	point is that we serve our public. We serve you in
7	doing this. So the comments that you make tonight,
8	we're going to take on record. We'll be evaluating
9	those. We'll be answering those and those answers
LO	will be available to you in the future. And the
L1	near future. We're not talking about years. We're
L2	talking about within weeks, if not, maybe a month or
L3	so. Very important that you come out. This is the
L 4	largest group we've had in our fourth brief and
L 5	final brief. It's a very important subject, so
L 6	thank you all for taking the time out and coming
L 7	tonight and I hope the location served all right.
L 8	So we're here to talk about the process
L 9	waste sites of 1, 3 and 6. And the cooling water
20	waste site 5. That's what CW and PW stand for.
21	That's the code for those things. This is our
22	agenda. We've already talked about the purpose.
23	We're not going to keep reiterating that. Again,
24	your comments tonight are very important. So I
25	encourage you to take notes during the topic. You

1 know, get all your concerns out. We'll stay as long 2 as it takes to hear you out and try and answer all 3 your questions. 4 I'll give you a background on the Hanford 5 cleanup approach. I'll try and keep that brief but 6 I don't know the audience and the experience of the audience. So I do want to kind of neckdown and kind 8 of zero in on the ares that we're talking about and 9 give you a brief overview of the sites so it gives 10 you a reference point for that. And then we're going 11 to talk specifically about the operable unit 200-CW-12 5, and the three other operable units 200-PW-1, 3 13 and 6. And lastly, we'll talk, again, about how you 14 can provide input. 15 So before we do that, we have a document 16 and it's available on DVD. It's kind of an 17 overarching quideline, strategy document that we use 18 called the Hanford Site Cleanup Completion 19 Framework. This is a document that guides us. 20

not a law. It's not an order but it guides us into how we're going to execute our cleanup. available to you. It's a public document. actually went out on public comment for this two years ago and this is the final document that we It's a living, breathing, document, so please have.

21

22

23

24

feel free to comment on this if you get a chance and if you've had a chance to read it. And it does exactly what you see here. Tells you what our goals are for cleanup. Tells you what the relationships are between the different areas that we organize within the government. So you understand how we're trying to achieve our goals here. And then it talks about the challenges that we face there. It will give you an excellent frame work for what we talk about every time we come out for these decisions for public comment.

Columbia River, coming through Richland, Tri-Cities down in this area. You see these four -- this graphic shows four general areas. The whole total area of the site is 586 square miles. And the green area that you see is the Hanford Reach National Monument area. It also includes an area of land that's an Ecology Reserve, Air Ecology Reserve, right here, which is basically Rattlesnake Mountain if you ever drive up there. That area is actually going to be -- the footprint is going to shrink on that this year. We're going to close out those areas, cleanup is complete. That's the good news. The other news about that area is that it's not as

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

complex a cleanup area. There wasn't a lot of waste
dumped in these areas. This is a lot of, kind of
garbage-type things that we cleaned up. So it was a
simpler area to cleanup. But the footprint is
shrinking. We are getting smaller on the plain in
Central Plateau in the River Corridor.

The next area is the River Corridor which is depicted here in yellow. That is the focus of our efforts over the next five years we think we'll get to close-out by 2015 of this area. So we'll shrink that footprint down. We have mothballed the We've mothballed them because they have reactors. cesium in them and other radionuclides that we want to take more time to clean out. But they are mothballed, they're stabilized, they are not leaking anything into the river anymore. And in about 70 years, we'll go back and clean those up. rest of that footprint will be clean and we're trying and we're going to achieve drinking water standards in that yellow area. Drinking standards in the yellow area. Okay.

So next area we'll talk about is this brown area and that's called the Central Plateau.

And I manage the Central Plateau. It's the heart of all the activity that happened, all the nasty stuff

1	that happened in Hanford to produce these weapons.
2	And or this weapon-grade material and that is the
3	most complex part of this cleanup. And within that,
4	you have two areas. An outer area which is the
5	light brown and an inner area which is the darker
6	brown. That's an important concept because in the
7	outer area of Central Plateau, we're going to try
8	and achieve the same drinking standard as the River
9	Corridor. We're going to try and achieve drinking
10	water standards in the Central Plateau outer area.
11	In the inner area, we'll try to achieve the same
12	thing. However, if we can't, at all costs, we're
13	going to prevent plumes of radionuclides from
14	getting to ground water and getting to the river, at
15	all costs. So that's the general strategy. Another
16	thing to note about this inner area that we'll talk
17	about more is that it's different. Not to get too
18	confusing, but we call it an industrial area. We
19	call it an inner area. It's going to have a
20	different land use than the other areas that we're
21	talking about.
22	The government, the Department of Energy
23	is going to have continuous presence there to
24	protect human health and the environment. That
25	means that we're going to be there monitoring the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sites and you'll see how dense it is with sites and why it's shaped like that in a second. We have a long-term commitment for custodianship of that site to protect you and the public and human health and the environment.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: 4,000 years you're going to do that?

MR. DOWELL: We're going to be there as long as it takes. We're going to be there as long as we need to to protect human health and the environment. That's the best I can say. You know, we got into a discussion last night and we've been, you know, amongst ourselves, we're sitting there going, "10,000 years, 4,000 thousand years?" government hasn't existed, you know, for several hundred years, you know, a couple hundred years, So, you know, when we talk about those, it kind of gets into a realm of a different science than the science we're talking here. So I can't say whether the government is going to be viable or anything like that. I don't want to make that comment. We're here to make sure that the human health and the environment is safe. We do that hand-in-hand with the EPA and that's all I can say. That area is going to be a long-term custodianship

1	for us at the Department of Energy. As you'll
2	probably hear as we look at the Comprehensive Land
3	Use Policy, the rest of these areas are being
4	considered for a use by Fish and Wildlife, general
5	recreation. There's no plans for building any
6	residences along the Hanford Reach or anywhere in
7	the Hanford area. It's going to be land use, but
8	not Department of Energy use. Whereas, the inner
9	area is ours, ours alone. You'll see why here in a
10	second as we neckdown. I think we're going to have
11	to keep questions until the end just so I can get
12	through the brief. Do you mind? I hope not. I'm
13	sorry.
14	So here's the Central Plateau. There's
15	basically three areas of the Central Plateau that
16	I've already discussed but I left out the
17	groundwater one. Groundwater we treat and we do

Groundwater we treat and we do pump and treat systems throughout the whole area of Hanford. And we'll continue to do that until we sense that the cleanup is complete. And after -and we'll continue to monitor that. In fact, every year we publish a report that's the result of that. That is available for public review. We use that to monitor the effectiveness of our cleanup so that's the way we determine whether we have to go back and

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

remediate if we had to do so in the future.

Now, I want talk about the inner area, but a little bit more on the groundwater and I know it was kind of competing with Gerry's brief at the same time, but we had pictures up here showing some of the progress. And we're building one of the largest groundwater treatment facilities in the world right now. 2500 gallons per minute will be processed in the Central Plateau. And I'm commissioning that plant at the end of December. Very exciting, so we're making a lot of progress out there and we're trying to do the right thing in treating the water before it has any chance of getting to the river.

So when we look at the footprint, this is that inner area blown up. And you notice it's a very unique kind of footprint. It has a very odd shape and that shape is defined by these progression of decisions and recommendations that we've made through the year that's in your briefs that hopefully you picked up at the table. I'm not going to go into these in detail, but what it does show you is that there's multiple partners using it. It also shows you that there's multiple sites that we use for managing the waste and holding the waste for long term. So as you look at this area, you can see

1	it's not a nice geometric, you know, rectangle or
2	anything like that. It's 10-square miles ultimately
3	and it's locked solid with the waste sites that
4	remain that we're going to have to have long-term
5	custodianship of. Things like the tank farms.
6	Things like the environmental remediation of
7	disposal facility, ERDF, in the middle. Things like
8	the nuclear reactor burial site up here, or the
9	Department of Ecology in Washington, low-level
10	radioactive waste disposal site here. That
11	footprint is defined by the stuff that we're going
12	to have to keep an eye on for a long time. And
13	that's why it's shaped that way. So we try to
14	minimize that footprint, very important concept.
15	And this kind of summarizes that. No. 1,
16	is that we tried to minimize it down to and it's
17	down to 10-square feet or 10-square miles. I wish
18	it was feet. 10-square miles and, you know, that's
19	a manageable area. That's something that we can
20	manage long term. I think the resources are
21	achievable for that and it's important for us to do
22	that. We also or going to be making risk-based and
23	cost-effective cleanup decisions in this area. It's
24	going to have a different use. It's not going to
25	be, you know, used for general recreation. It's not

going to be controlled by the Fish and Wildlife 1 2 Department. It's going to have barriers assigned to 3 You won't be able to access it as part of the 4 It's just going to be a bunch of burial public. 5 sites that have to be monitored and that's really 6 what it's down to in that area. So it's not --7 there's no future for this area for residences or 8 other uses that we see. At least not in this 9 foreseeable future.

We're also going to make sure as long-term custodians, we protect human health and the environment. That's job one. That's what we're trying to achieve there. And over the time that we make these decisions, for instance, this is one decision on 22 areas out of about 800 areas we'll have to make decisions on over the future decade or And those kinds of decisions we have to make -get to these decisions but it doesn't stop there. Our commitment with the EPA is that we continue to monitor the effectiveness. In fact, it's law that we continue to monitor the effectiveness of these sites and make sure that they're doing what they are supposed to be doing. If we have indications that something is wrong, something's failing, we get samples that show that there's more remediation

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

necessary, we have to go back and remedy that. And the good news about that, if it is good news, that's probably not the way to characterize it, is that, if we notice what kind of technology we'll be able to leverage, 20, 30, 40 years from now, if that were to happen. And it doesn't happen very often because we try to make these decisions as fast as we can. And tonight, we feel that we have enough information to make this decision. So that's why we're here.

Lastly, before I turn it over to Emy, I'm just going to talk briefly about the CERCLA process so you can understand exactly where we are, wherein this process goes. So we started with the site inspection. We looked at records, all sorts of -we tried to, you know, as we looked at the areas, we're trying to gather information to see what kind of decision we're going to make, to see if it met a threshold to make a decision, then we determined that it needed to. So we went through our remedial investigation. That's where we dug deep into data. Looked at the history, the precedents, all the operational logs, everything that was done in this Some of this is very well documented; some of area. it is less well documented. And where it's less well documented, we sample and we try and balance

1	the sample needs with the documentation so that when
2	we get enough information, we feel solid that we can
3	come to the public with a decision and go for a
4	decision on this and get on with the remediation.
5	And get on with the progress on the site.
6	After that, we go into a feasibility study
7	which evaluates the risk and generates a set of
8	alternatives. And we're here tonight to present
9	those alternatives including a preferred alternative
10	that we've identified for your comment. Now, we
11	received comment on this two years ago is when we
12	came out. And then we came back with a proposal
13	plan and this is the official time when we actually
14	come back out for comment. So here we are today
15	looking for your comment for a preferred
16	alternative. If you noticed, we listen to you, we
17	actually changed significantly some of the
18	remediation of these sites with the input that we
19	received earlier. So that's why it's important and
20	it's really exciting to see how many people are here
21	tonight because I really like that. It really helps
22	me out. So we get to the record of decision. That's
23	when we, basically, when we analyze the public
24	comment at the Tri-Parties, the three parties of the
25	State of Washington Ecology, the EPA, and the

1	Department of Energy get together, review the
2	decision, changes as necessary, that turns into
3	remedial action which means that we actually execute
4	that plan through a design plan that goes through
5	the actual implementation and then we get into the
6	review process which by CERCLA had a five year
7	reevaluation of the effectiveness and review. On
8	the Hanford site, we review that annually, the whole
9	site annually on the basis of the sampling that we
10	do on an annual basis. And of course, in actual
11	operations right now, and active remediation, a lot
12	of activity sampling comes with remediation as we
13	pull up ground sites and remediate the water, pump
14	and treat and do our monitoring.
15	One thing to note, and I'll leave on this
16	is that in the CERCLA process, we have threshold
17	criteria which takes us to a decision it has to meet
18	a specific criteria whether it needs remediation and
19	then we go into balancing criteria which basically
20	looks at effectiveness long term, short term, the
21	reduction of toxicity, or mobility, and the volume
22	of treatment. Those are all elements of what we're
23	going to talk about tonight. We look at the
24	implementability, whether we can do it or not,
25	whether, you know, engineering wise it's

1	feasibility, the technology and readiness level of
2	that technology and then we look at the cost and we
3	balance all five of those things. A lot of people
4	say that we drive everything by cost. I don't do
5	that. I don't think that's a wise thing to do
6	because these decisions have to be made long term
7	for generations to follow.
8	So on that note, I'm going to turn it over
9	to Emy. She's going to give you some background on
10	the areas we're talking about tonight.
11	MS. LAIJA: Can you hear me okay? No?
12	How's that? Better. Okay. Well, my name is
13	Emerald Laija. I work with the Environmental
14	Protection Agency. I am the EPA's project manager
15	for a number of the waste sites we are going to be
16	talking about tonight. What I wanted to do is just
17	provide some background information on how these
18	waste sites came to be.
19	So, J.D. talked about how the Hanford site
20	is broken up. We're looking at waste areas. The
21	inner area is divided in half. We have the 200 West
22	area on the left-hand side and then the 200 East
23	area on the right-hand side. So the waste sites in
24	the 200 West area, they primarily have plutonium
25	contamination and separated from those on the East,

1 200 East area, we have the cesium contamination 2 sites. 3 So let's take a closer look at what's 4 going on in the inner area. There are a lot of 5 sites out there. There are hundreds of waste sites. 6 So when we are looking at remediating them, we break them up into small units group them accordingly to make it more manageable. So in looking at -- sorry. 8 9 I know you really can't read what's up there, but if 10 you look at the different colors to give you an idea 11 of some of the separation that we've done. 12 sites we are looking at tonight are dealing with 13 soil contamination. As J.D. mentioned, our 14 groundwater is also contaminated at Hanford but we 15 do have activities in place to address that 16 contamination. So we're just looking at soil 17 contamination for these waste sites. 18 So just how do these waste sites come to 19 This graph here, is a simplified representation be? 20 of how it happened. In the central part of Hanford 21 we had huge processing facilities and that's where 22 we processed our plutonium that we were making 23 during the Cold War. And during those activities,

we generated thousands of gallons of liquid waste.

At the time, the way to dispose of that waste was to

24

1	discharge it to the ground. So it was discharged
2	into the cribs or trenches directly. So when we're
3	looking at these waste sites, I know we already
4	mentioned the names don't make a lot of sense, 200-
5	PW-1, 3, and 6, means nothing to anyone. So when we
6	were looking at these waste sites, we said, "Okay.
7	Well, how are they similar?" We looked at the
8	historical knowledge that we had. Process knowledge
9	and the data collected during sampling, and grouped
10	these into smaller waste groups that made more
11	sense. If the waste sites are similar, ideally the
12	cleanup approach you use could be implemented across
13	all the sites in that waste group.
14	So we have the Z-Ditches and the Low-Salt
15	sites. These waste sites received liquid waste that
16	was contaminated with plutonium and americium. For
17	the most part, this waste didn't travel too deep
18	into it ground. And the Z-Ditches it goes down to a
19	depth of about 15 feet below ground surface and
20	then in the Low-Salt sites, it went down to about 25
21	feet. So relatively shallow. Then we have the High-
22	Salt sites and these sites are of particular
23	interest to a lot of people here. These sites are
24	different. There's three of them total, but the
25	liquid waste that was discharged here was highly

1	acidic. It had carbon tetrachloride and nitric acid
2	and that just allowed the contamination to travel
3	deep, low into the soil column all the way to
4	groundwater. That's what makes these waste sites so
5	unique, the fact that the plutonium was able to
6	travel down to the carbon tetrachloride to these
7	depths. It goes down to about 100 to 110 feet.
8	That's why it was able it reach groundwater.
9	As far as the carbon tetrachloride goes,
LO	that is a nasty substance. So we actually
L1	implemented a soil vapor extraction system in the
L2	early 1990s to address that contamination. Something
L3	we couldn't wait until other decisions were in
L 4	place. We had to act on that faster because of the
L5	risk that it posed. So we are running our soil
L 6	vapor extraction system and that system will
L 7	continue to run no matter what decision we end up
L 8	making for the other wastes sites. That has to
L 9	continue running to address that carbon
20	tetrachloride contamination. So that will continue
21	on into the future.
22	The next waste group is the cesium-137
23	waste group. Those were the ones that were located
24	separately in the 200 East area. Again, here, the
25	waste is fairly, shallow, traveled down to a depth

of 28 feet or so for those sites. We also have two 1 tanks that were used to collect solids from the 2 3 liquid waste. Think of it as an old septic system. 4 You flush the toilet, the solids go into a tank, 5 dirty water is then disbursed into the ground 6 usually over a gravel, excuse me, a bed of gravel. So that distributes the water and allows it to That is a very, very simple way of 8 percolate down. 9 describing what happened here, but it's generally 10 the same idea. 11 So I'll go ahead and hand it over to J.D. so he can talk about the alternatives. 12 13 MR. NILES: You've got about six minutes 14 left. 15 MR. DOWELL: Okay. Good. So we went down 16 these areas. There's six areas we're going to talk 17 200-CW-5 we're going to talk about is one of 18 the six. And Emy already talked a lot about the 19 ditches and there's a good depiction of this on the 20 first screen on your left there in front. The next 21 one after it also shows the exact ditches and what 22 they look like so if you get a chance and you're 23 curious about these things, we put the ones that are 24 kind of most interesting up here and you can take a 25 look at those after the brief or during it if you

want to walk over there.

Three shallow open ditches, known as Z
Ditches. 4200 feet is the longest one and they are

-- if you look at this picture right here, there's

actually four ditches in this picture but you don't

see a ditch anymore. They've all been filled in for

a long time. That's typical of what a waste site

looks like here. They receive cooling water and

10

11

14

looks like here. They receive cooling water and steam condensate from the plutonium finishing plant.

And that plant was a single pass plant but it

12 material. This was not like dumped. It was actually

actually -- it wasn't designed to dispose of this

13 like leaks in the condensate piping that resulted in

some of the material being released. So it's kind

of an interesting anomaly, but they clearly didn't

16 catch it in time because there's a significant

17 amount of material in the ground. Contamination's

18 located primarily at and below the bottom of the

19 trenches. The trenches go down. They are fairly

20 shallow and you'll see our remediation is going to

21 take care of that pretty well. Primarily risk

22 drivers are americium, plutonium, cesium and radium.

So when we look at the alternatives, we

24 are required by CERCLA to look at no action. So

25 that's just a requirement by law. If you're

1	curious, we're trying to do a fast one or something
2	like that, we actually have to look at that. It's a
3	benchmark to see what the effect would be if we did
4	nothing. The next one is maintaining existing soil
5	cover and providing institutional controls such as
6	controlling access or putting limitations on how the
7	land will be that's another option. Another one is
8	remove, treat as needed, and dispose, which is RTD.
9	It's a common acronym that we use for remediation.
10	And then engineered surface barriers can be any
11	types of barriers, but they're basically engineered
12	to evaporate water and not allow it to penetrate the
13	ground and drive these contaminants further or
14	deeper into the soil or to the groundwater.
15	You'll hear one called an
16	evapotranspiration barrier. And basically, what
17	that's designed to do is not let water get down
18	below into the areas where the contaminants are so
19	they can't go any further and have any more mobility
20	or any mechanism to provide mobility.
21	In-situ vitrification is a fancy term for
22	glass, glassification. So what happens here is we
23	put electrodes across, basically, catty-corner from
24	each other, basically four electrodes. And it can
25	be more if you have a larger field and put a charge

1	in there and it basically glassifies the soil in
2	place to hold that material there. That's another
3	example. Typically, those fields are limited to
4	about 30 to 40 feet. And lastly, we can do a
5	combination of alternatives. So for the CW-200-5
6	area, we are performing alternatives to remove,
7	treat, dispose of that material down to 15 feet and
8	dispose as required. When I say dispose as
9	required, it's either going to go off site if it's
L 0	low activity waste, it goes into WIPP, the Waste
L1	Isolation Pilot Plant down in New Mexico where we
L2	sent TRU waste.
L3	The next five will be discussed over the
L 4	next four slides. So this is 200-PW-1, 3, and 6.
L 5	As Emy talked about, PW-1 and 6 are on the left side
L 6	of the 200 West area of the Central Plateau area.
L 7	And CW-3 is on the right-hand side and you can see
L 8	how these are organized here. 1600 ground
L 9	engineered liquid waste disposal sites. So these
20	were engineered sites that were designed to dispose
21	of waste efficiently. Not like the trenches in 200-
22	CW-5. These are fully designed to get it deeper
23	into the ground. It's important to understand the
24	organization because that's how we'll talk about the
25	preferred alternatives. High-Salt, Low-Salt,

Settling tank which is a geometry and then cesium which is a radionuclide, is conserved, lastly, other sites. And this will make sense as I go through the alternatives.

operations, primarily, from the plutonium finishing plant and also from the Purex treatment plant. These are just dump sites from those operations. Risk drivers, plutonium, americium, and carbon tetrachloride. And lastly, the PW-3 site is primarily driven by cesium-137, and again, we'll talk about that in a second.

So going over the possibility of alternatives, the only difference is that on maintaining the existing soil cover, we can maintain or enhance the existing soil cover on this one. And then we talked about engineering surface barriers as we in-situ vitrification, remove, treat, dispose, and then the soil vapor extraction is a mechanism by which we put a vacuum on the ground and we basically are extracting carbon tetrachloride in a vapor form so we can condense it and remove the solid material as we pull it out of the ground. It's a technique that's effective for recovering carbon tetrachloride.

1	AUDIENCE MEMBER: How deep?
2	MR. DOWELL: How deep will it go?
3	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Right.
4	MR. DOWELL: Well, it depends on where we
5	actually apply that vacuum. So we can get it as
6	deep as we want depending on where we plot the
7	vacuum.
8	DENNIS-EPA: Plutonium, J.D., it's around
9	100 feet and then we have some down as deep as 240
10	feet.
11	MR. DOWELL: Right. So the I full
12	that's basically the full spectrum of the soil
13	column. Okay. So going in the High-Salt waste
14	group, we chose a combination of alternatives. And
15	those alternatives include continuing to use the
16	soil vapor extraction system, to evacuate or
17	excavate, rather, the highest concentrations or two
18	feet of the contaminated soil. I won't say highest
19	concentrations. I'll say two feet of the soil is
20	contaminated, remove and dispose of the associated
21	structure. And then backfill the area with clean-
22	fill and then construct an evapotranspiration
23	barrier on top of that.
24	For the preferred all three for the
25	Low-Salt waste group in PW-1 and 6. We're going to

1	remove sufficient portion which is basically,
2	remove, treat, dispose of the material to depth
3	necessary to remediate and the apply an
4	evapotranspiration barrier on top of that as well.
5	In 200-PW-3, which is the cesium-137 waste
6	group, this material ranges in depth between about
7	10 to 12 feet down to about 20 feet and we're going
8	to maintain and enhance our existing soil cover and
9	to ensure that the waste site limited to 15 feet to
L 0	prevent any workers from coming in and excavating
L1	that material. And then that's all we're going to
L2	do with that.
L3	And then lastly, these two are our
L 4	Settling tank waste group which a couple of these
L 5	are setting tanks. They are basically large
L 6	concrete structures, basins that are holding a
L 7	sludge-like material and liquid. We are going to
L 8	remove the sludge and liquid containing both
L 9	plutonium and americium, remediate that, RTD that.
20	And then we're going to grout the remaining tank in
21	place, not removing the tank. And lastly, the 200-
22	PW-6 other site waste group, this is a no-action
23	waste group because we have no indications that
24	there's material left in significant concentration
25	or quantities to require remediation.

1	So how can you provide input? Tonight,
2	your presence, you'll be making comments. We've got
3	a recorder for that. We'll take those comments
4	here. We'll take them on paper tonight. You can
5	send us comments by email. We'll consider all these
6	comments with our Tri-party Agreement partners and
7	then after that, we'll issue a record of decision
8	and we are expecting to that record of decision by
9	September. Although we are talking about extending
10	public comment period. That's all I have.
11	MR. NILES: Okay. Share the mic back with
12	Emy.
13	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Will there be a response
14	summary matrix to all public comment before the
15	issuance of the record of decision?
16	MS. LAIJA: The response summary actually
17	comes out as part of the record of decision. So
18	there will not be a document that comes out before
19	for that with formal responses. I'll just be a
20	minute with this part and then we'll get to your
21	questions, if that's okay.
22	So a second ago I was speaking and giving
23	you some educational information on the sites. I'd
24	like to take just a minute to let you know where EPA
25	stands as far as the preferred alternatives that

1	were identified tonight. EPA mission is to look at
2	the protection of human health and the environment.
3	We've looked at these alternatives and have
4	determined that, yes, they are protective. However,
5	one of the criteria we do look at when we're trying
6	to decide on a decision is the public input. That's
7	one of the criteria that's listed on this display
8	over here. So being here, providing your comments,
9	saying what you like or don't like or how you think
10	we should change the preferred alternative is very
11	important. It has direct impact on the decisions
12	we're going to make. EPA's particularly interested
13	in hearing your input on the cesium sites where we
14	proposed bringing in backfill to maintain a 15 foot
15	depth of cover over those waste sites. This is a
16	new approach for EPA, so we are very interested in
17	hearing what you have to say about that. And of
18	course, the High-Salt sites which are that go so
19	deep, we're interested in hearing what you think
20	about that as well. Thank you.
21	MR. NILES: Thank you, Emy. We'll get the
22	test on this microphone here before I blast you.
23	So I'm going to step away from the
24	moderator role for just about two minutes and
25	provide you with an overview of Oregon's comments

and then	we're going	to hear	from Dan	Serres	s from	l
Columbia	Riverkeeper	and ther	n we'll g	o into	the Q	. &
A.						

Outside the room is a copy of our letter
we submitted to the Tri-Parties. In my opening
remarks, I mentioned six waste groups and four of
them, the first four I said we're fine with that,
and we are. And I do want to acknowledge the change
that the Tri-Parties made from a few years ago when
they were proposing basically leaving all of this
material in the ground. And now they have moved
quite a bit on most of those sites. The concern we
have is those two other waste groups that I
highlighted. The cesium waste sites and the High-
Salt plutonium waste site. We have had the
State of Oregon and the Department Energy, U.S.
Department of Energy have had a long running
disagreement, if you will, about the mobility of
plutonium. In our view, the soil chemistry in
Hanford can result in to some mobility of plutonium.

And so we have concerns about leaving large amounts of plutonium in those three waste sites. And what we were proposing is what's called an observation approach where it is you begin to excavate, you're also sampling, you're seeing what's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there. If two feet gets, you know, the bulk of that concentrations drop, then two feet is great. Our assumption is it's probably going to have to take them deeper than two feet. And if it's three feet or five feet or 20 feet, we would like to see sampling going and using that observational approach and removing the bulk of that plutonium.

On the cesium waste sites, I think, I'm probably going to surprise a lot of you because we are saying that we believe that this might be a satisfactory resolution to the cesium sites. And it goes with the same argument I just gave in that the soil chemistry and interaction with various contaminants, with cesium we do believe it is immobile in soil, that it doesn't move and does not present a threat to groundwater. And given its much, much shorter half-life of about 30 years, our caveat was if the U.S. Department of Energy can maintain control of the site at the surface, and keep use of fertilizers and things like that off the surface which could remobilize the cesium we would So that's be willing to accept this as a proposal. kind of a summary of our comments from Oregon. Again, there's copies of our letter just outside and around the corner there, which I hope you'll take.

1	So back to the moderator role. Our last
2	speaker before we get to our question and answer, is
3	going to provide a local alternative perspective.
4	He's Dan Serres with Columbia Riverkeeper
5	MR. SERRES: My name is Dan Serres. I'm
6	the conservation director with Columbia Riverkeeper.
7	I know I'm joined by a number of members of the
8	Hanford Advisory Board here, as well. I want to
9	point out a couple procedural things before I really
10	get started which is first, there are fact sheets
11	that are going, our lovely assistant Chuck, and
12	Scott. He's got fact sheets if people want to know
13	more about the proposal from our perspective and
14	also how to comment online or in writing. The
15	second thing is both Heart of America Northwest and
16	Riverkeeper have sign-in sheets going around. If
17	you heard about this meeting from us or if you heard
18	about it somewhere else, it's a good way to stay
19	connected with us and then you hear about future
20	meetings as they come up.
21	Two other things I want to point out.
22	There are a couple definitions that I want to
23	provide for people that came up in the presentation.
24	One that's a really important one is TRU waste. What
25	does TRU waste mean? That's really when we're

1	talking about plutonium. It's something that is
2	it's a long half-life and it's present in
3	concentration of 100 nanocuries per gram or greater.
4	So it's a high concentration of really long-lived,
5	really radioactive stuff. TRU waste, transuranic
6	waste, is stuff that has to go off of the Hanford
7	site. One of the big debates that we have about
8	this proposal is the idea to leave plutonium waste
9	in the ground, first of all. And then second,
L 0	whether those concentrations should be regarded as
L1	transuranic waste and leave the Hanford site.
L2	To be blunt, Riverkeeper disagrees with
L3	the conclusions of the U.S. Department of Energy
L 4	about the handling of plutonium waste and these
L 5	waste sites. Our position is not controversial. Our
L 6	position is joined by consensus advice by the
L 7	Hanford advisory board which is a broad based
L 8	Advisory Board that to quote the Hanford Advisory
L 9	Board said, "Plutonium is forever." That's the
20	perspective that we bring to this debate. We're
21	very concerned that the idea at the idea of
22	leaving large amounts of plutonium in the soil. The
23	Hanford Advisory Board also advised that the cesium
24	waste sites are well-suited to removal, treat and
25	dispose alternative. That is some of this waste

14

18

25

isn't that deep. So by digging it up, it wouldn't 1 2 really be all that expensive. You can move it into 3 a place that is much more stable. The frame of protectiveness rests on a few 5 key assumptions that have been laid out already. The 6 first one being plutonium will not move. Oregon 7 Department Energy has already stated they don't 8 agree with that. I don't agree with that. I think 9 it's important to remember 24,000 years is a long 10 time and that's one-half life. The rule of thumb 11 for radioactive waste is 10 half-lives. 12 talking 240,000 years that this waste will be left in the soil and could remain dangerous. 13 From our perspective, that's a very difficult assumption to 15 accept. You also have to assume that the caps will 16 remain effective over a very long period of time. 17 Evapotranspiration barriers it has some success in

19 have failed. It's very -- it's a huge concern for 20 us that these barriers will be used over plutonium 21 sites that will, again, be there for tens of 22 thousands of years. It's not a viable assumption to 23 us that this contamination won't be mobilized in the 24 future by whatever climate exists, let's say in 15

some places, some not so successful in others.

Naegeli Reporting "The Deposition Experts"

or 100,000 years.

(800) 528-3335 NaegeliReporting.com

Another key assumption is that the site
will be under control for ten of thousands of years.
That's very, very difficult assumption to make this
week as we approach budget meltdown. The idea of
continuous presence is one that I think is I
believe it when the Department of Energy says they
want to control the site and they don't want people
in this Central Plateau. I just don't believe that
it's possible for tens of thousands of years. That's
where I think a lot of us will diverge from the key
assumption.

To put this in perspective, again, we take a geological view of the Columbia river and the threat that this waste poses to the Columbia. 13 or 14,000 years ago, Missoula floods were breaking through and sweeping down the Columbia basin shaping landscape in Eastern Washington in Hanford. They find fossils of bison, mastodon, camels out there, spread out through Eastern Washington including the White Bluffs right at Hanford. If you ever get a chance to paddle down the Columbia River, it's an incredible geological experience if you're looking at strata laid down by one massive flood after anothers. So it's very difficult to assume that the Columbia River will behave the way its behaving now

1	and that the climate will look the same tens of
2	thousands of years from now. We just think that
3	that assumption alone invalidates the conclusion of
4	this plan.
5	So what's the real justification for going
6	only two feet down? The justification is that it's
7	cheaper. That's really, you know, if you look at
8	the alternatives, the way they're laid out, they've
9	got one that goes two feet and the next one is 18
10	feet. And the difference in the cost is an
11	estimated 550,000 million dollars. So that's a lot
12	of money but what does ten feet get you? What does
13	twelve feet get you? We don't see that in this
14	analysis and that's one of the big gaps and it's one
15	of the reasons why DOE needs to go back to the
16	drawing board. At the extended site hearings, many
17	of you were there. We heard a commitment from the
18	Department of Energy, Matt McCOrmick, who stood up
19	repeatedly and said, "Look, cleanup is not
20	discretionary." We agree with that principle.
21	That's the right idea. That's the right attitude.
22	We applaud that. We think, though, that thorough,
23	protected cleanup is not discretionary. And that we
24	don't think that this plan meets that standard.
25	So the sort of one thing in terms of your

1	comments, think about the alternatives, think about
2	the assumptions and comment on those things directly
3	because I think those are the things that a lot of
4	people should be weighing in on. To get just to
5	bring it back to the cesium just really quickly.
6	Again, one of the issues with the cesium sites is
7	that they can be dug up and moved to a landfill
8	onsite, called the environmental restoration
9	disposal facility. ERDF. Sounds like you're getting
10	punched in the stomach. ERDF. But its' actually a
11	very useful place in the Hanford site that can be
12	used to take the stuff out of the relatively shallow
13	soil and move it into a place that's more protected.
14	So to sum it all up, you guys heard from
15	Gerry before. You heard from the agencies. You
16	heard from me. Hanford Advisory Board has weighed
17	in. There's a refrain that's happening again and
18	again. Clean it up. Get the plutonium out of soil
19	as much as you can. I think it's a pretty simple,
20	straightforward message. We made it before. We'll
21	make it again if we have to. So thank you all, very
22	much for being here.
23	MR. NILES: All right. So we'd like to
24	we've had a couple questions that came up during the
25	presentations. That's what we'd like to do now is

1	clarifying things that you're not understanding,
2	answer some questions before we get into the formal
3	comment period. It's a tight room. We want people
4	to able to hear what your question is, but I guess
5	what I'm going to say is if you know you have a
6	booming voice and you're in the back then maybe we
7	can get by without a microphone for you. But if you
8	don't speak well, in terms of loud, we'll take the
9	time to get the microphone to you.
LO	Can I have a quick show of hands of the
L1	people that have some clarifying questions, so we
L2	can know where to start. There's somebody right in
L3	front of you with the microphone.
L3 L4	front of you with the microphone. AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm just trying to
L 4	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm just trying to
L4 L5	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm just trying to figure out where Hanford is regarding importing,
L4 L5 L6	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm just trying to figure out where Hanford is regarding importing, exporting or maintaining the waste, the
L4 L5 L6 L7	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm just trying to figure out where Hanford is regarding importing, exporting or maintaining the waste, the radioactive nuclides that you have. So is Hanford
L4 L5 L6 L7	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm just trying to figure out where Hanford is regarding importing, exporting or maintaining the waste, the radioactive nuclides that you have. So is Hanford in the position of bringing in any materials and
L4 L5 L6 L7	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm just trying to figure out where Hanford is regarding importing, exporting or maintaining the waste, the radioactive nuclides that you have. So is Hanford in the position of bringing in any materials and what percentage are you looking at exporting or
L4 L5 L6 L7 L8	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm just trying to figure out where Hanford is regarding importing, exporting or maintaining the waste, the radioactive nuclides that you have. So is Hanford in the position of bringing in any materials and what percentage are you looking at exporting or where would you export it to and why is that a place
L4 L5 L6 L7 L8 L9	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm just trying to figure out where Hanford is regarding importing, exporting or maintaining the waste, the radioactive nuclides that you have. So is Hanford in the position of bringing in any materials and what percentage are you looking at exporting or where would you export it to and why is that a place to keep and it where it is now?
L4 L5 L6 L7 L8 L9	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm just trying to figure out where Hanford is regarding importing, exporting or maintaining the waste, the radioactive nuclides that you have. So is Hanford in the position of bringing in any materials and what percentage are you looking at exporting or where would you export it to and why is that a place to keep and it where it is now? MR. DOWELL: Are you talking the greater

1	MR. DOWELL: No. There's no waste coming
2	into Hanford at this point.
3	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I come here every couple
4	of years and get updates. So I'm just
5	MR. DOWELL: Good questions.
6	AUDIENCE MEMBER: How much of the material
7	that you are expecting or anticipating to vitrify?
8	MR. DOWELL: Well, that's another good
9	question. There's for tonights decision it's a
10	little bit different. Realize that there's two
11	organizations with the Department of Energy. There's
12	Richland and Office of River Protection. And the
13	vitrification plant is going to be used primarily to
14	mitigate the 53 million gallons of tank waste that
15	exists on Central Plateau. And then the remediation
16	of those tanks is subject to the environmental
17	impact statement that's underway right now and we
18	expect to have that at the end of the year and then
19	there's a decision process going on as we speak, as
20	we negotiate, how that is going to be managed. So
21	the tanks, even though it's not related to this, an
22	update is that all that waste is going is
23	planning on being vitrified. An estimate for how
24	much of that is TRU and being shipped out, it's a
25	cannister count.

1	When you look at the cannisters that come
2	out of the vitrification facility at the waste
3	treatment plant, the high level waste cannisters, I
4	recall, are about 10 feet tall and two and a half
5	feet wide, and there's going to be about last I
6	heard the count was about 12,000 of those are TRU
7	waste that are going to be shipped out. That's for
8	waste in the tanks and those are rough numbers.
9	MR. NILES: J.D., clarify. You were
10	calling those TRU waste.
11	MR. DOWELL: Not TRU. You're right. High-
12	level waste. I'm sorry. It's high-level waste, not
13	TRU waste. Don't let me get you confused. Now, my
14	group actually reclaims TRU waste that we've got in
15	storage right now. So I have a program today, that
16	is reclaiming TRU waste that we knew where we were
17	going and we stored it, temporarily, according to
18	law, and now we're in the process of retrieving that
19	and sending that to WIPP. I've got the numbers
20	available but they're in meters cubed and they're in
21	the thousands of meters cubed.
22	So we have active shipments going down to
23	WIPP as often as we can. Subject to things like
24	fires and access to the roads, it's a very complex
25	process so get the waste shipped and it's on a

1	rotational basis with the State of New Mexico. They
2	have teams that come in that are certified teams
3	that come out and do that. But the bottom line is
4	that we are actively shipping TRU. We are not
5	actively making glass yet and high level waste
6	glass will be all be shipped to a repository to be
7	determined. And of course, you can see is news as
8	well as I, what's going on with that.
9	GERRY POLLET: I think if you can clarify.
LO	I don't want to leave the impression that no waste
L1	is proposed to come to Hanford. That would be very
L2	misleading. There is waste coming in right now. You
L3	take waste from the Navy and the proposal is to add
L 4	12,000 truckloads of radioactive, extremely
L 5	radioactive waste to be buried in a landfill or bore
L 6	holes right near where we're talking about in the
L 7	Central Plateau, that's that you called it
L 8	greater than Class C?
L 9	MR. DOWELL: Grater than Class C.
20	GERRY POLLET: And another volume that is
21	many times greater than that of low-level chemical
22	and extremely radioactive waste to go into the
23	existing landfill that's right next door to that.
24	And the modeling for that landfill shows, "Hey,
25	quess what?" It will contaminate groundwater,

1 seriously. So you shouldn't lead people --2 MR. DOWELL: Yeah. I'll stand corrected 3 on the fact that we do take Naval reactors. 4 They're low-level waste. You can are very stable. 5 walk up and touch those. The greater than Class C 6 decision is in process, so that decision has not 7 been made yet. Washington is on the short list of 8 names and that went out for public comment, as well 9 That public comment period is closed. recently. 10 don't have a status on that decision. 11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Three related questions. Will the WIPP facility fill up before all the 12 13 trenches can be remedied, so are we going to lose 14 our capacity for stuff that's dug up; why isn't the 15 State of Washington pursuing a higher standard of 16 cleanup like Oregon is relative to what's left 17 behind; and how come the projection maps of the 18 movement projected at the groundwater? Why do they 19 stop at the riverbank and not show offsite 20 migration? 21 MR. DOWELL: Okay. The three questions 22 there, I'll take the first and last. The first 23 question you asked -- you want to go first John? 24 MR. PRICE: Sure. Yeah, hi. My name is 25 I'm with the State of Washington John Price.

1 Department of Ecology and I'll answer your question 2 about why the State of Washington is not pursuing a 3 higher degree of cleanup like Oregon is. I just want to explain our role real briefly. There's a 4 5 lot of different problems to the Hanford site and 6 Central Hanford that J.D. talked about 800 7 individual waste locations. For Hanford as a whole, there's about a total of 3,000. So there's so many 8 9 of these we split up responsibility for reviewing 10 the Department of Energy's work between U.S. EPA, 11 that's who Emy's with, and then the State of 12 Washington Department of Ecology. So in terms of 13 your questions, I belive Department of Ecology does 14 favor a higher degree of cleanup like Oregon does. 15 We're generally in agreement with Oregon. I think 16 they do really good work and good technical 17 analysis. And I think the comments that Ken read to 18 you are pretty consistent with what Washington said 19 last year. Last year in July, we sent a letter 20 about this proposal the U.S. EPA National Remedy 21 Review Board. That's not Emy, but that's the 22 National EPA. And one of the things we said in 23 there was based on a relatively high degree of 24 uncertainty, Ecology requests a bias towards a more 25 robust remedy. So basically, we were saying, if you

1	can do more, please do more. So I think that's
2	pretty consistent with Oregon's comments.
3	MR. NILES: All right. So two questions
4	for you J.D.
5	MR. DOWELL: Your first question was on
6	the capacity. WIPP has a capacity as mandated by
7	Congress. Right now that capacity it's set to be
8	foreclosure date of 2039. And they are in the
9	process of extending that. Based on the extension
10	closure date, it should meet the current estimates
11	Hanford, those needs, through 2050. And I've got
12	numbers here but they are a lot of numbers. I could
13	show it to you afterwards if that's all right.
14	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Are those estimates
15	based on the more shallow soil level of only two
16	feet or can they be extended to accommodate more
17	deeper depth removal?
18	MR. DOWELL: They can be expanded to
19	accommodate deeper depth removal.
20	AUDIENCE MEMBER: How far, do you know?
21	MR. DOWELL: No, I don't know the exact
22	number. I mean, if you pulled all the plutonium out
23	of the site, the mass balance going to WIPP, I could
24	probably do the numbers quickly, but I haven't done
25	that. But WIPP'S capacity, it's a pretty

1	incredible site if you ever seen studies on it and
2	understand the salt mine processing. It's got
3	significant large capacity. There's other sites
4	similar to that geology in that region Texas and
5	other areas. In fact, those are being looked at as
6	long-term repositories. So the options for PW-1, 3
7	and 6 are adequate for our needs.
8	What was your third question?
9	AUDIENCE MEMBER: How come the groundwater
10	modeling projection map stop at the river corridor
11	bank and don't show off site migration potential in
12	the riverway?
13	MR. DOWELL: Well, the way that that model
14	once it gets to the river, it's as far as we need to
15	know. But the other thing to understand about those
16	models is that all the modeling that you saw that
17	Gerry showed you came out of the EIS, I believe.
18	Gerry, is that where your source was for that?
19	GERRY POLLET: The maps, yes.
20	MR. DOWELL: Those sites or all the
21	modeling is unmitigated. That means that no
22	remediation is taken. That's the way we do those
23	models that modeling. So as we go through these
24	decisions, it's going to significantly affect the
25	effects of those plumes and what actually gets to

1	the river to all of the constituents that Gerry was
2	looking at. So the modeling stops there because
3	effectively, as soon as it gets there we know what
4	we need to know. It got to the river and that's
5	AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's already in the
6	river. It's already in the river, flowing
7	downstream, correct?
8	MR. DOWELL: What? You mean material,
9	today, is flowing downstream?
10	AUDIENCE MEMBER: From Hanford, yes.
11	MR. DOWELL: Yeah. We have samples of
12	carbon tetrachloride actually from the river, well
13	below minimum standards that are detectable but
14	below drinking water standards. So from a
15	concentration perspective, we don't have
16	constituents like plutonium or americium reaching
17	the river at this point. We don't have any of the
18	things we are talking about here coming from this
19	site reaches the river.
20	MR. NILES: Next question please.
21	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm trying to clean up
22	some confusion that I was getting from the variety
23	of presentations that happened. And I also must
24	tell you that I watched the recording of the
25	youtube, the Seattle hearing that took place prior

1	to here, so I have at least some insight to what's
2	been said prior to this time. I want to go to a
3	point that was raised by Gerry Pollet regard the
4	standards for clean up of plutonium which seems to
5	have varied between government sites. And once
6	Gerry was done speaking and I asked him about that
7	question and then a person from the Environmental
8	Protection Agency over here said to me that there is
9	no standard right now for plutonium cleanup at this
10	site. I don't understand why this is being
11	allowed. What allows this variability between
12	sites? What is assumptions drive that and does the
13	law allow that to happen?
14	MR. DOWELL: The answer is that the law
15	does allow that to happen. The difference in the
16	variability was actually on the graph that Gerry
17	showed. If you look at the use end and what they're
18	trying to protect, with those standards and
19	realizing that they're in different states the use
20	for Hanford is to protect a worker. It's not for
21	residential usage. Significant difference in land
22	use and the need to protect what that site is going
23	to be used for. And that's what makes this
24	different because in this inner area, the land use
~ -	prevents extensive public use. There will be no

1	risk to human health and the environment from that
2	standpoint because of the prescriptive uses that
3	we'll have in this decision that are going to be
4	directed by a final record of decision that gets
5	made.
6	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, this raises
7	another issue for me. If the law allows this
8	variability, then what's the time frame that the law
9	sets that allows that variability. Because if you
LO	look at different time frames, there can be very
L1	different kinds of realities that affect the
L2	disposal of waste at these sites. So what is that?
L3	What is the time frame that you're supposed to
L 4	consider when you consider this variability, this
L 5	site's going to be industrial, this site's going to
L 6	be residential, etcetera?
L7	MR. DOWELL: Right. The alternative that
L 8	we'll follow will lead us to a record of decision.
L 9	That record of decision is the permanent record of
20	decision. So there's no time limit on that.
21	AUDIENCE MEMBER: So you're making this
22	up? That's basically what you're saying. You're
23	making this up. You're going to make up a record of
24	decision that says, this is the way this site's
25	going to be and it's not going to change over and ad

1	infinitum.
2	MR. DOWELL: No, no. The record of
3	decision tells us how we're going to remediate the
4	material. And then once that material is
5	remediated, that standard by which we talked about
6	going through the engineering process, the design,
7	implement it, and we'll monitor it. It will be
8	monitored with
9	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Over what time frame?
10	MR. DOWELL: It's monitored until there is
11	no longer a risk of health and human safety.
12	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do you have a time frame
13	for that?
14	MR. DOWELL: Well, the time frame its
15	continuous presence. Until there's no longer a risk
16	to public health.
17	DENNIS - EPA: Maybe explain here a little
18	bit. In regards to the cleanup, in the State of
19	Washington we really have only two choices. We have
20	unrestricted type cleanup choice, which we made
21	along the river. And we have an industrial cleanup.
22	We have all bought into the fact that this 200 Area
23	is an industrial area and so in essence, what you're
24	going to see over the next several years is
25	proposals to cleanup to protect industrial type

Having said that, we did run other 1 situations. 2 analysis. We ran tribal scenarios. We ran what we 3 call an intruder scenario where someone actually 4 gets into the waste, they bring it up and it's all 5 that risk is calculated. 6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is that on this disk? 7 DENNIS-EPA: I don't know what disk you have there. If it's the Feasibility Study, it is. 8 9 And the other thing. I'm right with you. I mean 10 it's hard to fathom having to control access into 11 these sites for perpetuity. But the reality is we 12 already made a number of decisions at Hanford that 13 that is the case. And we have to be hopeful that 14 the federal government stays in place and that there 15 are people out there to protect over the long term. 16 And that's just the nature of the beast. And I 17 I don't like it and I know a lot of people in 18 this room don't like it. 19 GERRY POLLET: Let me clarify. Since you 20 brought up my slide. The slide I showed, and we can 21 put it back on the screen if you want. It clearly 22 showed that the proposed cleanup standard for 23 plutonium that the Energy Department is proposing is 24 2900 picocuries per gram of radiation in the soil 25 along the Columbia River we use 35.

1	MR. DOWELL: Before you go on, Gerry,
2	we're not proposing a cleanup 2900 picocuries per
3	gram. That's not a limit that we go by.
4	GERRY POLLET: Okay. So do you want me to
5	read you a page out of your document and cite it
6	because it did cite it in the slides and we can put
7	it up. And the bottom line is in terms Lawrence
8	Livermore, the slide showed two different standards
9	being applied. 2.5 versus 2900, or 10 and 10 is for
10	office and industrial site use.
11	MR. DOWELL: It's a different definition
12	of industrial site.
13	GERRY POLLET: Right. And then we had a
14	dispute over whether or not the reasonable maximum
15	exposure scenarios controls here. Is it reasonable
16	to believe that the only people exposed will be
17	industrial workers for thousands of years? Because
18	that's what Washington State law says. It's
19	reasonable maximum exposure scenario over all time
20	frames.
21	MR. NILES: Let's move on to some other
22	questions.
23	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I've got two very
24	different questions. One is sort of give me a
25	budget picture, just sort of give me your best shot

1 at a budget picture for the next four years. 2 the other is why, when you fission a bunch of 3 uranium, you get numerous fission products and those 4 products produce radioactive daughters, and I'm not 5 quite sure why you're singling out two or three 6 radionuclides and how that thought process works. Are those the most dangerous or the longest lived or 8 the most mobile, or what? 9 MR. DOWELL: The first question on budgets, President's budget as you saw if you came 10 11 to the state of the site meeting was a billion --12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: DOE's budget. 13 MR. DOWELL: Which one? 14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm sorry. You told me 15 President. 16 MR. DOWELL: Well, we submit it and it's 17 called the President's budget when it comes out. 18 For fiscal year '12, it was a billion and six 19 million, 1.006. And we expect to have stable 20 budgets for those, for that time period. The best I 21 If I said we're going to get that every 22 year, you know, I got quoted, it's outside my 23 bounds. We're expecting stable budgets, but as you 24 all read in the paper, there could be some 25 That's what we're expecting right now instability.

1 at Richland. 2 Office of River Protection MR. DOWELL: 3 has a similar budget, it's more, about a billion So it's about 2.2 billion dollars that we have 5 invested in Hanford and if it stays stable, that's 6 what we're expecting through 2015. Then your second 7 question, you kind of captured it yourself. It is 8 driven by the predominant risk. These are the predominant risks in the radionuclides that if we 10 mitigate these we capture most of rest. 11 capture those three, you're going to get most 12 everything else. 13 MR. DOWELL: Correct. A lot of the 14 accountables, you know, when we talk about, for 15 instance, PW-1. That site started in 1949 and went 16 through 1972. And it's got about 3.6 million 17 gallons of stuff. So a lot of the chemicals are 18 When look at the tanks and you hear the 19 number 1600 different types of chemicals, those 20 still exist. They've been isolated. So the 21 radionuclides are really the heart of the matter for 22 us and that's how we characterize those sites. 23 CHUCK JOHNSON: I'm Chuck Johnson, from 24 the board of Columbia Riverkeeper. I want to come 25 back to the question of this being able to guarantee

1	that this is an industrial site. I'm just wondering
2	which is a more, in your opinion, rational
3	assumption to make that we can guarantee a site be
4	an industrial site for 23,000 years or 230,000
5	years, or that we can find the money to dig up that
6	plutonium and take away that requirement that would
7	guarantee the site remain an industrial site. Which
8	do you think is more reasonable?
9	MR. DOWELL: It's a very good question.
10	It's the question that is probably the heart of what
11	we're here for tonight. How do we balance a
12	decision in perpetuity when you can't even say
13	perpetuity for a government or social system or
14	anything like that. I go back to the CERCLA process
15	because it drives the answer to both questions.
16	Again, we trying to balance those five things we're
17	talking about before and cost is one of them. And
18	where cost comes into effect is when I look at the
19	resources that we're going to get. We just talked
20	about those and we look at the number of sites that
21	we have and we balance the risk of what's remaining
22	and try and get to the things that have the highest
23	risk top people and human health and the
24	environment. So in doing that, ideally, if we could
25	put the three or four trillion dollars that it took

to make these weapons back into the cleanup, it would be nirvana. I would do exactly what you're asking me to do. I can't do that because I have to balance those risks. I'm in a system of constraints and when I look at that system of constraints, it drives me to do risk-based decision making.

So when we assess the risk and we talk about things like mobility of plutonium, we do the best study we can. We make a best effort we can we get as much information as we need to make that decision. We balance that decision according to those five things. It's not driven by budget, but we got realize that there's other decisions that have to be made that balance the risks of those decisions.

The other point was in CERCLA process, this is the thing that does it for me about the 10,000 years or 20,000 years -- I'm like you. I don't know if the government is going to be here in 10,000 year or a Missoula flood is going to come or what's going to be happening in that time frame. There's a lot of risk in the future. What I do know is this, CERCLA requires me hand-in-hand with the EPA to revisit the effectiveness of these plans and it's not just the technical effectiveness. It's the

1	programmatic effectiveness. So if somebody in the
2	future wants to take the fence down in this
3	industrial area, I'll be right with you because I'd
4	be screaming about that coming down. We've got to
5	make sure we have long-term presence and a
6	commitment to maintaining those controls. We have
7	to do that.
8	AUDIENCE MEMBER: You're going to be dead
9	in 50 years, probably like me. Are we doing to dig
L 0	you up and get accountability at that point?
L1	MR. DOWELL: I hope not. Real quickly,
L2	let's say budgets continue down or we want to
L3	release that area somehow. What are the
L 4	technologies that we're going to be able to leverage
L5	in 20 to 30 years that will help us do that. We
L 6	don't even know what's going to be out there. So
L 7	let's talk realistically what's in the future in
L 8	your future and how this gets mitigated because we
L 9	can't talk 10,000 years. That's where the risk is
20	but how are we going to be able to mitigate that in
21	the future with future technologies? I'm hopeful
22	that if those technologies can come to bear, but the
23	decision has to stand and the decision is made based
24	on a fact of what we have today. And we made that
25	balancing those risks and then we revisit the

effectiveness of that decision and that's the law. 1 2 And that's what you adhere to is the law. 3 MR. NILES: Before we have the next 4 questions, I thought I'd get a show of hand who has 5 outstanding questions before we get to the formal 6 comment period. Let me just do a time realistic 7 We have many some complicated questions that 8 take long drawn-out answers and I would guess it's 9 going to be another 40 minutes before we get to the 10 public comment period, if we keep going the way 11 we're doing. If that's what you want to do that's 12 your choice to do that. We will stay as long as 13 need be. But there is a formal opportunity to provide a comment that will have to be responded to 14 15 and certainly this is a good dialogue that we will 16 not get once we shift into the formal comment 17 period. So I just want to offer that out to you as 18 we continue. 19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So if we keep asking 20 questions, we won't get an opportunity for the 21 formal --MR. NILES: You will. You will We're not 22 23 going to cut that off. 24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So we can be here all 25 night?

1	MR. NILES: I just think that not
2	everybody will want to stay here all night.
3	AUDIENCE MEMBER: We're checking to see if
4	we can have the room that late.
5	GERRY POLLET: Since the court reporter is
6	recording us, can we ask that everything that's been
7	said, be considered comments so far?
8	MR. DOWELL: Absolutely.
9	KARIN: No, no.
10	MR. DOWELL: Oh, it's not? Why not?
11	MR. NILES: If we want to do that, I would
12	suggest that we go into that formal public comment
13	and then come back to the question and answer.
14	MR. DOWELL: So what do you folks think of
15	that?
16	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Will you describe the
17	formal public comment again.
18	MR. NILES: Well, it's not that much
19	different than what you're doing. It's giving
20	people an opportunity, but it's more to provide a
21	comment as opposed to a Q & A. Here we're trying to
22	we've gotten far beyond just trying to clarify
23	some things. We've gotten into a bit of discussion
24	which is a great thing for people to understand and
25	I think the agency takes a lot out of that. But if

1	the formal comment period you're not going to get a
2	dialogue back.
3	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a clarifying
4	question that's very, very quick.
5	MR. NILES: All right. Let's hear it.
6	Actually, the woman right here.
7	AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's not really a
8	clarifying question, though. It kind of is in a
9	way. It's to stimulate some thought. I'm going to
LO	go ahead. So I was looking at the history of
L1	Hanford and my question is to you, after I say a
L2	couple things is, why should we believe anything you
L3	say? First thing, is that history is is that the
L 4	deactivation was 2000 and then you continued to
L5	dump stuff. And every time something came up, you
L 6	tried to sneak in something that said you want to
L7	continue to dump stuff. So here we are talking
L 8	about cleaning up some stuff that was already dumped
L 9	and you continue to dump stuff and then now you
20	still want to dump stuff there. So think about
21	that, you know, when we make our comments, because
22	there's always you always have an agenda and I
23	know you're trying do the best you can but we have
24	to get really serious with this. I mean, I
25	understand everything that's going on an I'm really

```
1
   unhappy. It's not a question except how can we
 2
   trust you.
 3
             MR. DOWELL: Okay. How can you trust me?
   Well, from a personal integrity stand point, I'm
 4
 5
   part of the public.
 6
             AUDIENCE MEMBER: No. Not you, not just
 7
         You seem like a really nice a guy.
 8
             MR. DOWELL: I'm not a very nice quy, I'm
 9
   sincere.
10
             AUDIENCE MEMBER: Your presentation was
11
   great but --
12
             MR. DOWELL:
                          Hard working for you.
13
             AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- I don't belive a
14
   thing that comes out of your mouth because you
15
   represent the Department of Energy.
16
             MR. DOWELL: If I work for a place that
17
   doesn't have that integrity, I won't work there. So
18
   I'm still working there. I feel that the
19
   administration now -- I can't talk to a precedent or
20
                            I think there was times when
   a previous decisions.
21
   that happened. I think there was misunderstanding.
22
   I think, you know, in this day and age you look at
23
   from the top down, you look at a bottomless
24
   commitment to transparency and I take that to heart.
25
             AUDIENCE MEMBER:
                                So you your saying
```

1 somebody else did all this but now it's going to be 2 different. Is that that what you're telling me? 3 No. I'm saying I can't speak MR. DOWELL: to the precedent of that. I can just can speak to 4 5 what I do, what my manager does, Matt McCormick. 6 can speak to the people that are around me and I 7 think it's -- if that was what it was before, then, yes, it is different. 8 9 MR. NILES: I've just been told we've got the room until 9:30. Then the crew at the 10 11 university needs to start breaking down this room. I 12 would suggest, unless someone really does have a 13 quick clarifying question. 14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I do. 15 MR. NILES: All right. Then I will hold 16 my speaker to a quick answer. And it's hard because 17 Hanford is so convoluted to give a quick answer. 18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: The the question that I 19 have is a clarifying question. Let me see if I can 20 rephrase what you said -- I think you said a minute 21 What I understood is that no matter whether we 22 are correct in saying that plutonium does have 23 mobility, etcetera, whatever the things are. Even if 24 all those things are true and even if you were to 25 accept that, that ultimately you're constrained by

1	that being only one of five or six factors that
2	you're forced to deal with in the Department of
3	Energy in a making your decision; is that right?
4	MR. DOWELL: All I can say is that, it is
5	input to that decision. And that's a valid
6	decision. But, I'll tell you one thing, when we
7	hear it at all four sites, we take it very
8	seriously. So we look at the things that we've
9	heard and they're similar to we've heard tonight,
10	the recurring theme is get more plutonium out of the
11	ground. So we've heard that loud and clear. That's
12	something we'll take back. We're going to evaluate
13	that very, very, honestly and make sure that we do
14	the right thing. So the answer is yes, it is one
15	element, but committed to looking at it hard.
16	DENNIS-EPA: One other clarifying point is
17	that again, we look at each waste site individually.
18	So he used the example if it was mobile. If it's
19	mobile, we're going to make a different type of
20	decision. Because again, there we're we got to
21	protect the groundwater. And so you've got to look
22	at it individually and so again, what may be good
23	for a plutonium site may not be good for a chromium
24	site.
25	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a quick yes or

1	no question.
2	MR. NILES: Good. Yes or no question.
3	AUDIENCE MEMBER: This might be a question
4	for the EPA but how much consideration has been
5	given to climate change impact in the creating this
6	is proposed plan and how much has been given to sort
7	of major floods which could affect this site? How
8	much of that has been taken in consideration when
9	coming up with this plan?
10	AUDIENCE MEMBER: And earthquakes.
11	MR. NILES: You can't answer that yes or
12	no.
13	MS. LAIJA: We have not looked at that
14	time scale for this decision. I can elaborate or I
15	can leave it at that.
16	MR. NILES: Any other yes or no questions?
17	AUDIENCE MEMBER: You talked earlier about
18	removing a substantial amount of plutonium for Low-
19	Salt sites. Can you define substantial, please.
20	MR. DOWELL: I quickly change my answer
21	because that's one one that Ken brought up too. When
22	we say substantial, we're taking two feet of
23	material that we talked about in the Z-9 crib. 30
24	centimeters was taken in 1976 to '77. We're taking
25	two more feet. That's the answer. That's it for

1	now. So that's a good place for you to input. If
2	you think that we should be taking more of that
3	again, when you look at that site, the remediation,
4	there are original remediation plans which was legal
5	which was effective, and protecting human health and
6	the environment was capping that site and we're not
7	going to taking any plutonium out. This is for the
8	mobility site, too, because when we did the Gerry
9	showed you data from the EIS, environmental impact
10	statement, and when the Central Plateau for these
11	sites the same model that showed those plumes shows
12	plutonium stable.
13	MS. LAIJA: J.D I think your question
14	is how much it getting taken out. At those, the
15	Low-Salt sites where we talk about the majority of
16	it, that's about 90 percent. At the High-Salt sites
17	where we say two feet, or substantial that's about
18	half, 50 percent.
19	THE AUDIENCE: How do you know it's half?
20	And why is it half and not all of it?
21	MS. LAIJA: As far as how do we know it's
22	half, we look at the inventory and the process
23	knowledge on the sampling data that we had to
24	determine how much is there and then going
25	calculating how deep it would go and how much we

1	would remove, that's how we determined those
2	numbers.
3	AUDIENCE: MEMBER: That was sampling data
4	from the the '50s or the '70s, correct?
5	MS. LAIJA: We use historical process
6	knowledge so some of it is older and then more
7	recently data from our remedial investigation. And
8	that is a long process that's but the short answer
9	MR. DOWELL: Well, let's talk about
10	sampling because the Z-9's C-1A and Cribs, trenches
11	all had samples as recently as 2006. That includes
12	
13	AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's not annual
14	samples.
15	MR. DOWELL: No, but you see we use those
16	samples to characterize only what's necessary. These
17	samples, you know, when you look at a sample like
18	this, it's very complex sample. It's a large tube,
19	it's not like a sample of dirt just coming out of
20	the top three feet. It's a bore hole sample and it's
21	actually like taking a well pipe, pounding that
22	down into the ground you get a full straight
23	stratification pour sample bringing that back out
24	using all use all radioactive measures to prevent
25	contamination spread, and then evaluating that

1	sample. These cost about a million dollars a piece
2	when we sample, so we want to minimize those or cost
3	perspectives.
4	AUDIENCE MEMBER: How far down do you
5	bore?
6	MR. DOWELL: It depends. It
7	depends on where we're boring, depends on what we're
8	looking for. You go where the constituents. So if
9	we know and have process data or three base samples,
10	and we're trying to do our characterization bore or
11	a well, we'll go where we think characterization is.
12	And usually they're very accurate. You only want to
13	drill or bore once and use that money wisely. And
14	we only do what's necessary enough to characterize
15	the extent of that flume. It's a balancing act
16	getting the right amount of information minimizing
17	the amount of costs in getting that. But
18	ultimately, we get enough information.
19	THE AUDIENCE: So do you only have money
20	to do the job.
21	MR. DOWELL: I'm not saying that at all.
22	AUDIENCE MEMBER: It sounds like it.
23	MR. NILES: Okay. Any other questions?
24	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Public historical are
25	you working out to the data that you're finding, how

1	many surprises do you have bases on what you're
2	expecting to find in the area. So how good is the
3	historical you're basing this off of the known
4	input were the 1960s records crap
5	MR. DOWELL: It's more than that. Less
6	than necessary as accurate. I won't use the "C"
7	word. If they are not accurate enough or if they're
8	inadequate, we sample. We have to fill that
9	information with sampling. You have to have enough
10	information necessary to make the decisions, so we
11	fill up the information that we don't have from
12	process knowledge with sampling. And in the cases
13	we're talking about, Z-9 trench, uranium, the High-
14	Salt field, we've got bore hold samples and deep
15	well samples, 2001, 2006. And we continue to take
16	log samples, scintillation log samples and samples
17	from those time periods. So it's not all 1990's and
18	'70s and the '80s. And we have to have enough
19	information to get us through the CERCLA process to
20	that decision.
21	AUDIENCE MEMBER: So how much of this
22	model material happened in perpetuity.
23	MR. DOWELL: Annually we make an
24	assessment of all sampling information that we have
25	on the site.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: But you're not sampling 2 annually. 3 MR. NILES: Can I move us along. It sounds 4 like we're not going to get to where people are 5 satisfied with the answer. I think that's something 6 that you're going to have to make in your comment. 7 MR. NILES: We've got a question over here and right there and then let's go to public 8 9 comments. AUDIENCE MEMBER: 10 Were any a proposed 11 remediation methods, do you guys consider any 12 underground fencing for, you know, to preventing 13 further, you know, not migration not of the soil or 14 contaminants but, you know, something that's open 15 that can let things go through to protect, like, 16 animals that go down and bring stuff back out. I 17 was imagining this wildlife refuge with the 18 industrial are in the middle and I've heard of the 19 animals getting in and spreading the contamination 20 and then also if there is kind of underground 21 fencing that locked you could get back through it if 22 That if in 100 or 200 years someone you needed to. 23 trying to dig a basement and they get to this and 24 say, "Okay, wait. Below this maybe there is some 25 major contamination." So about like underground

fencing -- and then also reference to the financial 1 differences of two feet versus 18 feet? 2 3 MR. DOWELL: So the first question is a 4 barrier question about the biological risks. 5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. Not top at the 6 top but into the ground. 7 MR. DOWELL: From that perspective, when 8 you make these decisions, you look at the effectiveness and how much you have to remediate 10 things like plant roots that go down, animals that 11 dig, and typically the standard is that top layer of soil. So the first 15 feet or so, depending on what 12 the decision is or where it is, is that critical 13 14 element that prevents this intrusion event of an 15 animal coming in or a plant that takes the material 16 out of the ground and turns into a tumbleweed and 17 ends up blowing into Pasco, or something like that. 18 That's all done in that first eight to 15 19 feet of soil column. When you talk about barriers, 20 that's in a three-dimensional standpoint like down 21 deep or on the sides. There are technologies that 22 work for specific radionuclides and constituents 23 that we are testing and using today. They are not 24 being applied in this decision and they were not 25 considered for this decision. Technologies don't

```
1
   work for these sites.
 2
             AUDIENCE MEMBER:
                                I mean, so specifically,
 3
   in 200 years there's some sort of steel-like,
 4
   physical feature, the people go, "Okay, I can't make
 5
   a basement here."
 6
                          Like an armored cap or
             MR. NILES:
 7
   something like that?
 8
              AUDIENCE MEMBER:
                                Yeah.
                                       An underground
 9
   cap.
10
             MR. DOWELL:
                           We lump those things into
   what we call institutional controls and everyone
11
   hates that because it's institutional. But that's
12
13
   the kind of thing we use to mitigate the site and
14
   it's part of the decision so it goes into the record
15
   of decision.
                 Those particular actions are actually
16
   defined in that. Now, right now there's no plan for
17
   a large metal cap or anything like that.
18
   basically what you're seeing here and then the
19
   controls for what that site looks like -- Dennis, do
20
   you want to talk to that?
                               No?
                                    Okay.
21
             MR. NILES:
                          And then your second question
22
   I think was the cost difference between two feet
23
   versus 18 feet and, yes, that is in the proposed
24
   plan.
25
             MR. DOWELL:
                           It's also in your handouts.
```

1	We did look at other levels. We didn't put it in
2	the plan that you're seeing. But we looked at four
3	feet, six feet. It's almost linear, sometimes,
4	when you look at that and the cost. So from a
5	program perspective, it's not quite that simple, but
6	it's close to linear and we can estimate that fairly
7	easily.
8	AUDIENCE MEMBER: With regards to the
9	observational approach advocated by the State of
10	Oregon, did the DOE consider that and if so, did
11	they disagree with it and what were the reasons for
12	disagreement with it generally?
13	MR. DOWELL: We talked about the
14	observational approach, specifically in the High-
15	Salt area and when we talk about that it goes back
16	to why we're remediating that. Again, we could have
17	satisfactorily met the requirement to protect human
18	health and the environment by just capping that
19	material because the material and we based the
20	assumption on the material being stable, not
21	immobile, but stable. Because our modeling
22	indicates that these areas of plutonium in the
23	Central Plateau, the same models that came from the

previous plume diagrams that Gerry had from our EIS,

it shows that this material is stable, not moving

24

25

1	for 10,000 years, and that's the extent that we can
2	model to. So that's the decision that we have. Now,
3	let's say tomorrow, the day after we make the
4	decision, we get a better model.
5	In fact, there's no other model out there
6	being looked at right now, and that model states
7	something else, we have to remediate according to
8	what we know and what we discover in the future. So
9	that's kind of the part of the process of the law
LO	that protects us to flawed decisions. But the
L1	decision we're making right now is not flawed. It's
L2	a good decision based on what we know and we have
L3	enough information to make this decision now. But
L 4	we do have the ability, when it doesn't work and we
L 5	are required by law to go back and make the
L 6	remediation effective for the long term.
L 7	AUDIENCE MEMBER: So what you're saying,
L 8	in effect, is that observational approach is the
L 9	status quo or something like it. Like, if you get
20	better information, at some point in the future, you
21	will revise the decision?
22	MR. DOWELL: Observational approach is
23	usually when you're remediating a site specifically
24	to protect human health and the environment. So as
25	you did sampling to determine you got the material

In this case, we don't have to get the 1 out. 2 material out at all. We're taking material out 3 because we got a lot of comments about it, a lot of 4 concern from the public, initially, that the first 5 time we came out of this process. So we changed 6 that and we're talking two feet. That's how it So it wasn't required whereas in the changed. 8 content you're talking about, as we dig down and 9 we're remediating a site specifically to protect 10 human health and the environment, we continue until we have the right level of material out. 11 12 MR. NILES: Okay. So we've had, I think, 13 a great discussion and I think Tri-Parties agencies 14 certainly got a lot of feedback and hopefully you've 15 gotten some clarity on some of your questions. 16 we will shift into the formal comment period that 17 we've got about 60 minutes before lose this room. 18 So if we could get a show of hands how many people 19 are anticipating wanting to make a form comment. 20 So we're going to have to try and hold you 21 to three minutes, or so, and if you want a second 22 go-round after everyone has had their turn. Karin,

maybe if you could actually start -- I did make a

could start back there.

commitment to the back of the room.

23

24

25

So maybe you

We've got two people with

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

microphones going around. Paige, I'm going to start with you as soon as Karin gets to you. Again, I'm sorry — this is the part that the dialogue ends and they just receive the comments. Let me also say, if you wouldn't mind stating your name. You're not under any obligation to do so but if you would feel comfortable stating your name.

PAIGE KNIGHT: I'm Paige Knight, President of the Hanford Watch here in town. And I will make my comments brief. The United States Department of Energy promised the citizens of the Pacific Northwest in 1989, that they would cleanup the vast contamination of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation which for the past half century has compromised the health safety of people who have lived in the region and who have relied on the great Columbia River to provide water for inhabitants and viable crops. We are over the sacrifices many have made in living with the production of plutonium as a deadly This plutonium has already entered the element. Columbia River and as evidenced in your reference quide is a continuing threat to the groundwater and Columbia River. Plutonium has a half-life of 24,000 years meaning it will take 240 years -- 240,000 In the early days of cleanup years for it to decay.

of the site the public was told that it would take 1,000 or more years for the plutonium that contaminates this 10-square miles and more of the Hanford site to reach the Columbia. A few years later, and I remember this meeting clearly, it was the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board Meeting, Ken, where the Department of Energy informed us that they had discovered the plutonium was much more mobile than they thought and it was moving more quickly. So I want people to take note of that and most of you probably suspected it any way.

with due diligence. It must be done to the highest degree possible, with testing and removal of contaminants in hot spots, treatment of waste and safe disposal. The proposed evacuation of two feet below the crib zone is unacceptable. According to the Oregon Department of Energy's findings in these documents, contamination was found at up to 200 feet deep at some spots. Capping cesium or blending clean topsoil with contaminated soil is a sloppy and unconscionable approach. The serious waste needed to be disposed of at Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico -- or they need to be disposed there.

Saving pennies at the expense of present and future

1	citizens is a pound foolish anyhow it's thank
2	you. In here I have a parenthetical, note the
3	increasing threats to our health and cost of
4	healthcare right now. We, of the Pacific Northwest,
5	have had to fight for every advancement in cleanup
6	of the site. As we slowly move forward in the
7	cleanup, new plans continually arise to bring more
8	waste here and to do less than that which provides
9	health safety and the future for the region and its
L 0	inhabitants.
L1	It is impossible to promise that no one
L2	will live in the Central Plateau area in the decades
L3	to come. That is not the answer. We want a
L 4	"surgical approach," and there I am using the
L5	comment from the Oregonian today. Do this cleanup
L 6	effort. We have been promised.
L 7	JAN CASTLE: My name is Jan Castle and I
L 8	would second everything Paige just said. I think it
L 9	is there is no reasonable expectation of being
20	able to keep control of this site for as long as
21	would be necessary. That's just impossible.
22	Therefore, we are morally bound to get as much
23	plutonium out of there as possible. The two foot
24	limit does not sound like it will be adequate so I
25	would like to see you continue to do the checking

and continuing to go until you find that you've 1 2 gotten it. I know it will be expensive but it is 3 absolutely necessary. This is land that belongs to the tribes. To leave this here and expect that it 5 will be an industrial site seems to me a violation 6 of a promise long made and as we have violated all 7 of our other treaties with tribes. So I think it's 8 unreasonable to clean it up to the industrial 9 standard. It needs to be cleaned up, period. 10 returned to reasonable use to the tribes as 11 promised. 12 MR. NILES: Thank you, Jan. Thanks for 13 being here. 14 DVIJA MICHAEL BERTISH: Hi, I'm Dvija 15 Michael Bertish from the Rosemere Neighborhood 16 Association in Vancouver -- sorry? I want to 17 address the risk-based decision making which I 18 understand is important regarding trying problem 19 solve what steps you do first and in what order. 20 However, I want to remind everybody that within the 21 past century, some Japanese ancestors placed signage on the shores of Japan and said, "Don't build here," 22 23 because of tsunami warnings and everybody forgot 24 about that and built their reactors. And then, 25 again, more modernly, they were told, if you do,

bury them so nothing happens and those decisions	
were disregarded. So risk-based assessment planning	ng
long term failed in that regard and now we have	
contaminated oceans and food an uninhabitable areas	S
and if you're going to pay those people \$9,000 in	
total for lost property that is tragic.	

assessment planning needs to, therefore, increase soil depth removal to the best and the lowest known depth possible with the high salt wastes that have been determined to be 100 to 110 feet at present. So I think you have to go far deeper than what you're planning. The cost of doing this now is going to be nothing if something cataclysmic happens in the future. It's not viable to think that any barrier is going to be maintained in perpetuity. So in this regard, I think the cleanup standards that are being proposed here are arbitrary based on the long-term projections.

We need cleanup standards to be far more restrictive as applied to the site to go as low as possible to the standard that's already in the Hanford Reach at 35 microcuries. One other thing to consider here relative to soil study is that I haven't heard anything about seismic shift or frost

1	heaving. So when you have vast swaths of solids
2	that are being bored and/or remediated, are open to
3	the general atmosphere and we have seasonal shifts
4	from rain and front that causes soil undulation. And
5	so the soil isn't going to stay in one place. So
6	anything that's built is going to move and soil will
7	fall and the residues that are beneath will rise up.
8	I haven't heard anything that describes how that
9	soil mobility will be controlled. Thanks.
L 0	MR. NILES: Thanks for your comments.
L1	LOREN PAULSON: My name is Loren Paulson,
L2	I had a job once that allowed me to look into the
L3	future on an eerily similar situation as we have
L 4	here. In World War II, the U.S. Government
L 5	manufactured nerve gas in an obscure plain now known
L 6	as Torrance, California. I worked for Shell Oil
L 7	Company at the time and the federal government sold
L 8	that site to Shell Oil Company to make pesticides.
L 9	Pesticides is nothing more than nerve gas. Years
20	followed and after 40 years of making nerve gas and
21	pesticides on this sites, housing developments
22	started to move in. And Shell Oil sold that site to
23	Cadillac Fairview, a company that then decided to
24	put in a high-end industrial site across the street
	from this housing development.

1	They bored a hole to make sure that
2	foundations could be poured and covered it up and it
3	is now one of the Superfund sites in California
4	right across the street from a housing development.
5	So as you look in the future with certainty about
6	how this property is going to be used in the future,
7	think about Torrance, California, Shell Oil Company,
8	the U.S. government and nerve.
9	MR. NILES: I'm going to have one of you
10	go to the woman bouncing the baby in case she needs
11	to leave before this ends and take a microphone back
12	there. And if we could just get another brief burst
13	of hands just so the people with microphones can
14	know where to start heading.
15	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just a rhetorical
16	question really quick. If we can do half, why on
17	earth are we not going to do all of it?
18	JOHN HALISS: My name is John Hallis. I'm
19	with Oregon Physician's for Social Responsibility
20	and I'd like to record that our physicians are in
21	accordance with the position of Hanford Advisory
22	Board and that of the Columbia Riverkeepers and
23	that of the Heart of America Northwest. It is we
24	support the removal, treat and dispose solution and
25	we think that it is a great mistake to restrict the

1 depth of the excavation. That the plutonium should 2 be removed from whatever depth it is found and we 3 also support removal of the cesium from these sites. 4 MR. NILES: Thank you, John. 5 My name is Chris and I'm a CHRIS: 6 physician here, living First I'd like to speak for 7 Mother Earth. I am very small. She's big. 8 You made it clean it up. Okay. Now, back to mess. 9 me the doctor. I'm psychiatrist. We have suffered 10 tremendously from denial. Denial is caused by fear which leads to a disconnect with thinking and 11 12 feeling and it leads to paralysis, lack of action. 13 And have we not seen a lot of inaction in cleaning 14 up Hanford. Now, it is so encouraging to me to see 15 that denial appears to be wearing thin. It's 16 wearing thin because people keep you know, nagging, 17 and saying, you know, nothing is not okay. Maybe 18 two feet is not okay if we went 18 feet. But anyway, 19 it's helpful. It would helpful, I think, to have 20 three-dimensional moving models shown. You can do 21 this with computers now. It's not square miles 22 we're dealing with, it's cubic miles. Okay. And 23 it's moving things not static things. So I think 24 putting models, three dimensional, moving them 25 around like you can and then showing the stuff

flowing might be really exciting and thrilling and 1 2 if we could just overcome our fear it wouldn't lead 3 to so much denial. The antidote to fear is love and 4 respect for all life. So back to the Mother, could 5 we all respect and love all life, taking into 6 account that we are very small. We can only think 7 ahead seven generations, maybe. For planning purposes, we can only think ahead two generations. 8 9 There is no fence. What there can be is this. 10 we will educate two generations below us up to 11 taking over our tasks when we die, we might be able 12 to carry it through for the 10,000 generations we will need. But we will need the seven generations 13 14 back, seven generations forward which our tribal 15 friends suggest to us. Thank you. 16 ERIC: Hi, I'm Eric. I'm an intern at 17 Hanford Challenge from Seattle. You talked about 18 not having projection for flood area or something 19 like that. I just feel it would be a lot better 20 proposal if there were projections for something like that. 21 It seems like building a house that is 22 not prepared to take or sustain an earthquake and 23 any reasonable person knows you ought to have that. 24 And so I just feel it's as though somebody needs to 25 go into the data for it to be effective.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a few quick points. What I'd like you to define and educate us about the effects of all of this on us as it gets more in the Columbia. The health effects, the salmon, the river, can our kids swim in it, all that kind of stuff. What exactly are we looking at if we only do a minimum. And even if we do the maximum that people are asking and I would like to ask that it all be cleaned up. Also I think we should develop alternative energy and I'd like to request that we have at least 30 days notice, preferably 45 days for these meetings, but I'm glad to see the turn out.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Obviously, I'm not qualified to adjudicate on the various scientific models around the migratability of plutonium, the soil or anything like that but all this being equal, given the sort of structure problem with DOE's inability to guarantee what's going to happen in 2 or 300 years, and that's fine. I totally understand that. That, I think, means that the DOE has a responsibility and that the parties involved have a responsibility to default to the more conservative solution, the more small conservancy solution. The fact that we can't guarantee 2 or 300 years from now

1 I think is the driving force. The reason why people 2 point that out so much, the driving force behind 3 that is the idea that as a result, we need to focus on removal and safe storage because we can't 4 5 guarantee that we'll be able to police the area and 6 we won't be able to shield the area from people coming to harm a few hundred years in the future. 8 And as a taxpayer, or rather as a future taxpayer, 9 because I'm a poor college student, I think I would 10 be comfortable supporting that in exchange for peace 11 of mind even at the cost of greatest expense. Maybe 12 not the full 18 feet, but I think at the margin, 13 greater excavation and greater removal of plutonium 14 from the site can better preserve the possibility of 15 real harm coming to people in the future. 16 MR. NILES: Thank you. 17 MARGIE: I'm Margie from Vancouver, 18 Washington. On the planet earth where I live, where 19 Hanford is located, is a living breathing planet 20 where life surges through it's veins. There's no 21 stopping any exposed liquids, chemicals, solvents 22 from getting into the soil, thereby contaminating 23 all soil and groundwater as well being carried in 24 the air. I do not want any covering up of those 25 extremely toxic contaminants. It must all be

completely cleaned up. And cleaned up to the 1 2 standards comparable to the Johnson standards, our 3 health depends on it. And one way that we can carry on the message is what the Native Americans do is 4 5 they have words of mouth. They have their legends. 6 It is something that we haven't done because certainly paper is going to be -- probably not 8 lasting 24,000 years nor are DVDs. So we are going to have to tell our children our grandchildren and 10 carry it on by word of mouth or petroglyphs. 11 CHUCK JOHNSON: I'm Chuck Johnson. the board of Columbia Riverkeeper and just to start 12 13 out with I'd like to support the Oregon Department 14 of Energy's position on the plutonium wastes that 15 their proposal to continue to dig below two feet in 16 the areas where the two foot limit was established, 17 to discover how much additional plutonium could be 18 removed to move in a measured way and to continue it 19 until virtually all of it has been remediated. And 20 secondly, to support our staff member, Dan Serres,

position that the cesium waste should be removed and placed in at the ERDF facility, onsite, at that additional cost. It adds one less thing that we

24 have to keep track of. And that's the main point

25 that I'd like to make is that I asked during the



1	question period Mr. Dowell from DOE, the following
2	question, which is a more rational assumption, that
3	the U.S. DOE will be able to guarantee that the
4	Central Plateau will remain an industrial site
5	without migration outside of the area for 23,000 or
6	230,000 years. Or if the U.S. Government finds the
7	money to remove treat and dispose of the plutonium
8	waste properly now and obviate the need to guard
9	that site for a ridiculous number of years.
10	Mr. Dowell responded with the CERCLA
11	process. In the CERCLA process if funding is one
12	the considerations that led to the decision they
13	made for only going two feet down talking out only
14	half of the plutonium under their estimates. I
15	mean it's immoral and extreme to make the
16	preposterous claim that the Central Plateau can be
17	kept an industrial zone in the foreseeable future
18	and for tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands
19	of years. And that it's our responsibility as the
20	people who generated that waste to protect future
21	generations. And it would be immoral to do anything
22	else other than to remove all that waste. Thank
23	you.
24	MR. NILES: Thank you, Chuck. We're
25	seeing some folks leave, so just let me remind you

1	if you haven't filled out one of the evaluation
2	forms, we do like the feedback and there's a lot of
3	material out in the hallway.
4	ROB PEARSON: I'm Rob Pearson and I have a
5	brief comment. I think everyone else has made some
6	really good points. I'm more concerned at the
7	testing in the CW-5 sites is inadequate. I know
8	during the Q & A session we mentioned it. Other
9	sites have been tested more recently in 2002 and
L 0	2006. But the fact remains that the CW-5 site most
L1	of it was tested before 1979, and a large portion of
L2	it has not been tested in the trenches since 1959.
L3	I'd like to see that change before you go any
L 4	further. Thank you.
L5	LLOYD MARBET: I very much appreciate all
L 6	the comments that have been made this evening. I
L 7	understand and feel great sympathy for the people
L 8	who are holding this hearing and asking for this
L 9	input, when in fact, we have to confront you,
20	unfortunately, with the insanity of this process.
21	Three minute comments on 240,000 year decision is
22	really not a great example of how to democracy
23	should work. My name is Lloyd Marbet. I am
24	Executive Director Oregon Conservancy Foundation and

1	State of Oregon. I'm here representing myself, my
2	family, and I'm speaking on behalf of the
3	conservancy foundation. Risk-based decision making
4	brought us Fukushima. It also is bringing us the
5	clean up of Fukushima, unfortunately. What are they
6	doing? Raising the standards exposure for the
7	people, when, in fact, they should be removing
8	people.
9	In fact, we even asked Japan to remove
10	people, evacuate people beyond the areas of the
11	contamination that we're now understanding is taking
12	place from this accident. The majority of the waste
13	that were produced at Hanford were produced in our
14	lifetime. I mean, we are the ones that are
15	responsible now for these wastes. And this
16	contamination should not be pushed off to future
17	generations. The buck needs to stop with us. It
18	really does. It needs to stop with all of us. And
19	it's, I think, immoral to make the kinds of
20	arguments that you're making here this evening to
21	pan off what you think is somehow an acceptable form
22	of disposal on this reservation. From my
23	perspective, it's a travesty. We deal with great
24	unknowns and long time frames of impact. Yet, the
25	unforeseen flaws in risk-based decision making grow

1	great as you grow out into time. It's just been
2	proven over and over again, especially with this
3	particular technology and now we're experiencing
4	climate change. I mean, give me a break. I just
5	cannot see how you can with a straight face even
6	talk about control in the uncontrollable situation
7	that we're getting ourselves into. Thus I think,
8	that we face a moral question here. We've always
9	confronted this as a moral question. I'm
10	disappointed in Oregon's new position now on
11	Hanford's disposal of these wastes. Now is not the
12	time to compromise on this. Not at all. Or sign
13	off on our responsibly to either fully cleanup our
14	mess now. I want, as a citizen of the United States
15	of America, for us to take responsibility fully for
16	what it is that we have done to this environment
17	now. I don't want to hear about these variables
18	that set up future generations to have no place to
19	go for accountability. No matter how sincere your
20	integrity, your coffin is not going to speak volumes
21	to the people that demand accountability in the
22	future for what we do here in this room and from
23	this room. Anything less is betrayal of our moral
24	responsibility to future generations.
25	AUDIENCE MEMBER. Specifically about the

1	upcoming record of decision, considerations to
2	somehow figure out a way to make those million
3	dollar tests much less expensive that we can have
4	confidence in the data and really where we need to
5	focus on. That's very concerning that it costs a
6	million dollars just to get information that we can
7	rely on. So invest in that technology. And
8	specifically about the cesium and the deep waste.
9	Some sort of robot or remote thing that will really
10	go down there and get, you know, figure out
11	something. Get really, really creative.
12	In that record of decision, I'm going to
13	look for some really great options and details. I
14	know that you're looking for some sort of details.
15	Everyone wants we want it all cleaned up. You
16	guys want to clean it up. We also all need to
17	literally call our congressional representatives and
18	that's where the money comes and that's where we can
19	say, I need another half billion dollars to cleanup
20	the plutonium there. And literally, very simple,
21	quick statement that captures that summary for them.
22	They're not tracking all of it but then they can go
23	back and pass it along to their budget committee. So
24	specifically about the record of decision
25	creativity, inspiration. Thank you.

1 MR. NILES: Another quick show of hands 2 who is still wanting to speak. Our folks with the 3 microphones are scouting you out. LAURA FELDMAN: 4 My name is Laura Feldman. 5 and I've come to a lot of these meetings. What I 6 have continually perceived as a huge disconnect between the lay people who come, like myself, who 8 don't really understand a lot of it, though I know more about this process than I ever did before. 10 still, I mean, I can say please dig up all the 11 plutonium and take care of the cesium. And I have a 12 zillion questions and I have a hard time visualizing 13 As that woman said, a little bit of computer 14 technology would help with that. But the bottom 15 line for me is that I want to stress stewardship. 16 saw a Frontline program last night about the atomic 17 artists in Japan. I was really inspired because 18 these are young courageous artists who actually some 19 of their pieces take place actually inside of 20 Fukushima or Fuji, one of the plants. They're 21 really courageous and what they are helping the 22 Japanese people do is reconfigure a different way 23 being on this planet. They're now faced with it. 24 They have to figure it out. So you know, it's huge. 25 It's just huge and the Japanese are having to learn

1	how to live differently immediately, now, as we
2	really do too. I mean, that's Fukushima times 50
3	I mean 100 miles up the river and I think it's an
4	nuclear holocaust waiting to happen.
5	And actually, it's happening now and we
6	need to engage people and not at these crappy
7	hearings where I'm presented with information I
8	can't possibly integrate really. Stewardship needs
9	to be happening at all levels and I think artists
10	and Shamans and psychologists and anybody who will
11	step into this breach and help us connect with this
12	issue. Help all of us connect with this issue so we
13	take ownership. Become stewards. We all have to be
14	together on this. And, you know, in terms of the
15	government telling you what you're doing, I mean,
16	we've been lied to and it's a very challenging
17	process and we all need to take responsibility. But
18	I highly suggest that you go and check out the
19	Frontline program that aired last night about the
20	atomic artists, Chim Pom, I think they're called.
21	Thanks.
22	MR. NILES: Thank you.
23	SOPHIA: Hello, my name is Sophia and I'm
24	here to share my views and those of my husband,
25	Jeff. We did live for a short while is this too

1 loud?

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 **AUDIENCE:** Yes.

SOPHIA: We used to live in Zillah, Okay. Washington, which is close to the Hanford waste site and now we are homeowners here in Portland. And I'm no expert in all the confusing terminology and all the technology that you shared in presentations with us tonight. So what I can offer to you is the consequences of human exposure to radiation. the Chernobyl accident happened, I was a very young girl in a children's theater group in Sweden. And we raised money to bring a few of the orphan children of Chernobyl to a lake for a weekend. Spending that weekend with those children of Chernobyl is never ever going to be something that will leave my memory. There was no way for us to tell who were boys and who were girls. These children were my age, at the time. They had no hair. They had no skin color. They looked like tiny, dying old men. And it is my expert opinion that no amount of dollars saving is worth the risk of reducing a hopeful child to ghost-like dying Removing two feet of the waste at the High-Salt cesium sites, is obviously not enough to avoid risk to human life for all future. And I believe



(800) 528-3335 NaegeliReporting.com

1	that the plan that proposed for the two sites is
2	based in cost savings objectives. And I want to
3	remind the representatives of both federal and state
4	agencies, and especially the EPA, that I'm
5	ultimately the one that is paying your salary. Your
6	task, what I'd like for you to do, is to protect
7	human health and welfare from environmental
8	degradation. You're not doing an adequate job with
9	the mentioned two sites. And to put it simply, it
10	is my opinion that you need to go back to your
11	offices and do the job I'm paying you to do, which
12	means RTD, I learned tonight, at the High-Salt and
13	cesium sites. We made a huge mistake in designing
14	these unsafe nuclear waste sites. And now we need
15	to remedy that by fully and rigorously cleaning
16	them. And I also want to add that you need to take
17	into consideration climate change impacts and
18	natural disasters in all planning for Hanford
19	cleanup. Thank you.
20	MR. NILES: Back of the room.
21	JOEL GARBIN: Hi, my name is Joel Garbin.
22	I both work in the storm water industry and also
23	I'm President of a non-profit called the New Energy
24	Movement. We educate about what is going on behind
25	the scenes in breaks for energy technologies that

1	generally aren't reported on by the media. Our
2	congress is inactive and ignorant of these things.
3	And, you know, unfortunately, our own U.S.
4	Department of Energy has been a blockade against
5	the information release of a lot of these things,
6	much less of active support. So we've seen it in a
7	very recent case where an inventor of cold fusion
8	based technology, has now been embraced by the Greek
9	government who is actively building three new
10	manufacturing facilities for that process that could
11	have been embrace by the American government. Well,
12	it was not because that particular inventor
13	recognized that it's not welcome here. This has
14	been going on, this type of lobbying industry based
15	partnership that keeps disruptive technologies in a
16	good way at bay has been really pathetic and a
17	disservice to our citizens and it continues. So
18	even though men and women of integrity with the
19	highest intent, and I do respect, and I believe you
20	that you're at work here. There are bad seeds much
21	higher up in the U.S. Departments of Energy. In
22	fact, there is a book out here that I encourage you
23	to pick up about break through energy technologies.
24	I also work in the storm water field and
25	anyone who has paid attention to these incredible

1	storms that we've been seeing globally, recognizes
2	the 100-year storm which is supposed to happen one
3	time every 100 years, in many places is happening
4	year after year. And even a 500-year storm. So it
5	was quite dismaying to hear that climate change
6	modeling particularly rainfall intensity has not
7	been factored into the clean up plan. That's
8	inexcusable given the high level of attention that
9	climate has on the front page of the newspaper
LO	everywhere. We see it. We see it in our climate,
L1	here in Portland. We see it everywhere. I do
L2	think, absolutely, the responsible thing to do for
L3	the present generations and those to come is to do
L 4	a more thorough cleanup. Two feet does not get it
L5	done. We should be going as deep as needs to be
L 6	done to get all the contaminants. And although we
L7	all recognize to economics based into these
L 8	decisions, it's much cheaper to do it now before it
L 9	becomes contaminated river cleanup and a devastating
20	health and environment consequences afterwards. We
21	cannot afford to cleanup at that point. We can
22	afford to do it now. So let's make the right
23	decision and take care of what's our responsibility.
24	We know there's going to be changes political,
25	economic, environmental that we're going to face

1	here probably in very short order and we will not
2	have the cultural memory in two generations to even
3	know what the hell was World War II, what was the
4	Cold War? I mean, let's face it. You know, our
5	children aren't really right now good students of
6	history, for whatever reason. I've got two of them.
7	All right. So I know that's the case. So it's on
8	us. We fouled it up. We've got to be responsible
9	for cleaning it up. Let's do it now. Thank you.
L 0	TOM COMFORT: My name is Tom Comfort. I
L1	also want to see the cleanup complete and the two
L2	feet is not sufficient. I've done farming in years
L3	past and I can tell you that the earth is not a
L 4	solid. A field that you plow one year and remove
L 5	all the stones, the next year when you plow that
L 6	field there will be more stones. The earth is
L 7	moving. The earth is a vibrant alive entity. And
L 8	to think that if you remove two feet of plutonium
L 9	the rest is going remain stable for perpetuity is
20	ridiculous. So I want to see more thorough cleanup,
21	as thorough as possible. Thank you.
22	KATHERINE: My name is Katherine and I
23	live in Vancouver, Washington. I work in Portland
24	with suicidal kids who are looking for adults to
25	make right decisions so they can have hope for their

1	future. Hearing this proposal makes my heart hurt
2	because there is nothing I can find right in it.
3	Balanced risk is a euphemism for selling them all
4	out. I was initially encouraged to hear what
5	Washington law requires but I'm appalled to hear the
6	Washington Department of Ecology is buying into
7	unreasonable assumptions. That incomplete cleanup
8	is sufficient to meet the terms of Washington law.
9	It isn't. The proposed plan is not thorough and not
10	protective in spite of the effort being made here
11	tonight to sell this plan under the guise of
12	balanced risk. The EPA and Washington Ecology are
13	obligated to dig up and remove all plutonium, cesium
14	and other radionuclides and chemicals and safely
15	place them in a repository. The right thing for
16	human health and the environment is to do the most,
17	not the least possible to protect us all. Thank
18	you.
19	MR. NILES: Okay. A show of hands from
20	folks that have not spoken yet and would like to
21	still.
22	KATHLEEN FITZGERALD: My name is Kathleen
23	Fitzgerald and I'm a born and raised Pacific
24	Northwestern. I'm a massage therapist. I'm the
25	mother of son who is 27 who lives up in the Gorge.

1	I have a lot of family up there. I've been up
2	there. It's God's country. Hanford is built on an
3	earthquake fault and if we have an earthquake, which
4	we all know can happen and things are changing,
5	there is really good chance that might happen and if
6	it does, it's going to cause radiation, radioactive
7	chemicals to spill in to the Columbia River and go
8	all the way down through more of God's country into
9	the ocean that would send a 500-mile radius all
LO	throughout that region will be pretty much
L1	uninhabitable. So that's a good chance that that
L2	could happen. I agree with what's going on here as
L3	far as complete cleanup, as far as we can get. I am
L 4	really disappointed every time I come to one of
L5	these meetings sorry, I'm trying to keep emotion
L 6	out of this.
L7	Every time I come to one of these
L8	meetings, these people stand up here and speak and I
L 9	want to like them. She's really nice. And the
20	other guy's you're a pretty nice speaker but you
21	talk really fast. There's no emotion. You're
22	disconnected from what you're saying. You have no
23	idea, really, what you're saying. You think you
24	know what you're saying, and it sounds good, but yet
25	here I am at a meeting we're talking about the most

radioactive site in the Western hemisphere in the 1 whole United States. And Hanford was decommissioned 2 3 in 2000, but here we are still -- you quy's want to still truck in more nuclear waste, when you haven't 5 even addressed what's happening in the current 6 situation and you still want to do that and that's the way you always are. You say, "Oh, yeah. 8 going to do this and we're going to do that," Blah-9 blah-blah. But now you want to cleanup half of 10 what's there. You want cap stuff off. EPA talks 11 about the High-Salt risk that's immediate -- that's 12 the one that's immediate going into the water. Yeah. 13 And you don't even want to clean that up correctly. 14 Stuff is already leaking into the Columbia River. We 15 already know that. I don't even want to buy fish 16 out of there. Okay. So what I'm saying to you is 17 as steward of this land. I love this place. 18 Columbia Gorge is my home. That's where I come 19 The DOE and EPA need new samples. You did 20 in 2001, 2006, now it's time for another one in 21 The plutonium could potentially move. 22 we know is hasn't moved since 2006? How do we know 23 where it currently is now, and how do we know how 24 I think two feet is not -- I mean, two far to dig? 25 You even said yourself that digging -- the

1	possibility of an animal to dig is maybe even 18
2	feet. That's what I think I heard you say. So I
3	think you need to at least go down, maybe I'm wrong
4	but I'm not sure, but it just sounded like it needed
5	to be more than two feet. So I think you need to
6	update the information so that you have more
7	information to go on.
8	The long-term risk-based assessment plan
9	is not an option. I agree with that. And I urge
10	and demand the EPA and Washington Ecology to insist
11	the plutonium, cesium and other radionuclides and
12	all the chemicals and everything be completely
13	cleaned up as much as possible. So here's just a
14	little bit more. Right now as early May 19th, 2011,
15	there was a letter sent out from a lot of people
16	that represent us. And I think it was May 23rd,
17	2011, there was a public hearing about them trying
18	to dump even more plutonium out there in Hanford.
19	That was a couple months ago. So on the 23rd, what
20	I was talking about, they shouldn't do that. So I
21	don't trust you. I don't trust what's going on
22	here. It doesn't matter the money. I think we
23	should spend the money and get it cleaned up. I
24	don't think that we should wait. I don't think it's
25	good idea. Please, I'm begging you to clean it up

1	right. Okay. Don't wait. Thank you.
2	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I just wanted to quickly
3	register my opposition to the absolutely pitiful
4	plan. I'm thinking about while still having decided
5	against the 12,000 truckloads. I was floored that
6	this even came up before that decision was even
7	made. I wish I could give you suggestions but I'm
8	the secretary of a hospital and I think I do my job
9	okay. And I hope that you do your job okay, but
10	clearly, clearly it is not. Two feet is pitiful and
11	this being the hottest spot in the Western
12	hemisphere, I can't imagine that you could show your
13	faces at international conventions that address this
14	sort of thing. I know in Sweden, they would laugh
15	at us, I mean, we would be ran off this planet if we
16	really, honestly looked at this. I tried to explain
17	where I was going to my eight-year-old daughter
18	before I came here, and even she clearly understood
19	that this terrible, terrible idea. Thank you.
20	MR. NILES: Thank you. We have a couple
21	more hands up.
22	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm I guess the word
23	is shocked that we're considering a remediation that
24	is going to require care in perpetuity while you
25	can't owen find the resources to do as much as we

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 can in the present to be adequately characterizing the site. And I've heard talk about, you know, 3 vitrification and other futuristic technology that ten years might get there when we're limiting right 5 now the resources that will provide towards doing 6 removal and cleanup that we could do with the technology that we do now. So it's just struck me 8 that -- that the promises that the same person is 9 making and seems to be heartfelt is just crazy 10 because in the next sentence you're saying what 11 you're not doing what we could do.

I'm concerned about the CERCLA process. It seems to me that leaving it in the state of deciding what the remediation will be and I was really glad to hear that there was some mitigation going on and some stabilization. But it was really reassuring from last year, but that as long as long as we characterize it as not yet cleanup, that the Navy can continue to bring things there. And I think that's -- I'm concerned that what I hear about leaving things in perpetuity in this site will mean that this is a site that by default will become a place that will become a repository. And that's all I've been hearing since I've been coming to these So I'm, once again, submitting that meetings.

1	concern. And I want to recognize and honor the
2	people who have already been harmed, the
3	Downwinders, the tribal people and all of the people
4	include my uncle who was based at Hanford during the
5	Army and never told. And I just lost my nephew to a
6	very rare disease that was probably generated by
7	that and so the assurances that care and perpetuity
8	will happen and the people who are already suffering
9	have experienced no accountability to the harm that
10	already happened. I just don't really understand
11	what about taking it and cleaning it up you don't
12	understand. I mean, this not reassuring. Thank
13	you.
13 14	you. JACOB O'BRIAN: Hello, my name is Jacob
14	
	JACOB O'BRIAN: Hello, my name is Jacob
14 15	JACOB O'BRIAN: Hello, my name is Jacob O'Brian. I'm 30 years old. I was born into this
14 15 16	JACOB O'BRIAN: Hello, my name is Jacob O'Brian. I'm 30 years old. I was born into this world and I didn't have a choice about the decisions
14 15 16 17	JACOB O'BRIAN: Hello, my name is Jacob O'Brian. I'm 30 years old. I was born into this world and I didn't have a choice about the decisions that were made before my time, the mess that was
14 15 16 17	JACOB O'BRIAN: Hello, my name is Jacob O'Brian. I'm 30 years old. I was born into this world and I didn't have a choice about the decisions that were made before my time, the mess that was created. To be honest, I'm pretty angry that we are
14 15 16 17 18	JACOB O'BRIAN: Hello, my name is Jacob O'Brian. I'm 30 years old. I was born into this world and I didn't have a choice about the decisions that were made before my time, the mess that was created. To be honest, I'm pretty angry that we are in this situation that we are having this
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JACOB O'BRIAN: Hello, my name is Jacob O'Brian. I'm 30 years old. I was born into this world and I didn't have a choice about the decisions that were made before my time, the mess that was created. To be honest, I'm pretty angry that we are in this situation that we are having this conversation right now. That we've been having this
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JACOB O'BRIAN: Hello, my name is Jacob O'Brian. I'm 30 years old. I was born into this world and I didn't have a choice about the decisions that were made before my time, the mess that was created. To be honest, I'm pretty angry that we are in this situation that we are having this conversation right now. That we've been having this conversation and that the best you can propose is
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JACOB O'BRIAN: Hello, my name is Jacob O'Brian. I'm 30 years old. I was born into this world and I didn't have a choice about the decisions that were made before my time, the mess that was created. To be honest, I'm pretty angry that we are in this situation that we are having this conversation right now. That we've been having this conversation and that the best you can propose is two feet. It's crazy. It's ridiculous. I have a

1 his children to have this legacy. I don't want any future generations to have this legacy. 3 know that I can be very articulate about this because I -- this is in many ways a new issue to me 5 but one thing that I do know is that I work for a 6 small firm. We're a data visualization firm. work with data all day long. I understand how 8 difficult it is to get a clear picture of what's 9 really going on when you do not have full and clear 10 data sets. When you don't have information that 11 fully tells the story and your'e trying to do models 12 or project things based on the situations that you 13 can't even account for but you don't control. It's 14 inexcusable. You have absolutely no right to stand 15 up there and say, "We're going to do the best we 16 can." Not the best you can. You have to fix it. 17 We have to fix it. I know that you'er human beings 18 and you probably have good intentions. You're doing 19 your job and I respect that, but your job is to 20 listen to us. Your job is to make sure it gets done 21 And I think it's absolutely disturbing. 22 Think about your children. Think about your 23 families. Think about our future and the legacies 24 that we have to leave on this earth. It's -- you 25 can't put a band-aid on it. You can't just say,

1	"You know what, this is good enough." 3,000 years
2	ago, we're like looking at pyramids and we're, like,
3	trying to figure out languages that people used and
4	communication forms that people used 3,000 years
5	ago. We can't even figure that out. And your
6	saying, yeah, 24,000 years from now we're going to
7	be able to communicate, "Don't go here. Don't mess
8	with this." No. That's insane. It's insane. Fix
9	it now. It's your responsibility. We support you.
LO	And if you choose not to, you're going to have to
L1	live with that and you're going to have to die with
L2	that. We all are. Not just you, we are all. That's
L3	the issue here. That is the issue. So that's allI
L 4	have to say. Thank you.
L 5	MR. NILES: Other folks with comments?
L 6	Gerry and then over here.
L 7	GERRY POLLET: I want to thank you all for
L 8	sticking with this tonight and for coming out, so
L 9	many people who have children at home. My name is
20	Jerry Pollet with Heart of America Northwest. There
21	is no way that I can imagine that Mr. Dowell and the
22	regulators can hear heartfelt testimony that given
23	tonight and come back and not say they've changed
24	their plans. At least they can't do that and say
25	we're responsive to the public. Thank you for being

1	here. Some of you got here tonight because someone
2	else made a phone call to you. So please make sure
3	you're on our list and maybe next time, if you have
4	a chance, you can make some phone calls to other
5	people you know to bring out to the next meeting.
6	I want to talk on behalf of in terms of
7	testimony, let me just start Mr. Dowell tonight
8	said, we will achieve the drinking levels standard,
9	"at all costs." We will achieve at all costs.
10	1977 the federal government passed the amended clean
11	water act banning the untreated water waste
12	discharges the same type of discharges that continue
13	at Hanford illegally for another 18 years, making
14	this problem far worse. At that time, and through
15	the late 1980s, when we started demanding an end to
16	these charges, because before that they were secret.
17	The mantra was, "It's too damn expensive," for the
18	federal government to transport the waste. At all
19	costs meant making bombs at all costs to help the
20	environment. Being angry about this, well we've
21	heard it so many times. It's hard to just be here
22	and say calmly. Oh, now we'll trust at all costs.
23	When the U.S. Department of Energy refused to end
24	dumping of liquid waste without treatment, making
25	these problems far worse. 18 years after the clean

1	water act amendment was made legal. And they
2	continued until 2004 to dump solid radioactive waste
3	for 43 miles, 11-mile soil trenches. Why? Because
4	it was cheap. And why does the Energy Department
5	say it's sitting with it's decision issued in 2004
6	to add about 20,000 truckloads or radioactive waste
7	to the landfill right near where all these sites
8	are. With chemical waste as well as radioactive
9	because it's cheaper than treating and disposing the
10	underground disposing somewhere else.
11	Why do they want to dispose of that
12	greater than Class C waste in Hanford? It's very
13	clear. The documents that many of you came to the
14	public hearing on laid it out. Hanford is the
15	second cheapest place to dispose of that waste in
16	near surface landfills. And the modeling for the
17	first landfill we were just talking about shows,
18	indeed, even with a liner it will leak and
19	contaminate the groundwater. Chemicals and
20	radionuclides. But trust us. This stuff won't move.
21	Has no liner, but it won't move. At all costs, we
22	will achieve drinking water standards. The only way
23	to achieve is to retrieve. The only way to achieve
24	it is to retrieve it. The PCB's in some of these
25	sites are 100 to 150 times Washington's cleanup

1	level. The carbon tetrachloride at these sites is
2	at astonishingly high levels. You can apply vapor
3	extraction to that between now and eternity, and
4	will still continue to contaminate the groundwater
5	over and over again for 10,000 years. Same
6	with the radioactive iodine and technetium and
7	cesium will move these sites were located in
8	places where the energy department also discharged
9	hundreds of thousands of liters of really,
L 0	incredibly good solvents from moving plutonium and
L1	cesium. And now that we are finally able to assess
L2	a feasibility study, which for most of this time
L3	period you couldn't even access and I appreciate
L 4	that EPA last night said that the comment period
L 5	would be extended to accommodate being able to
L 6	review the studies. On that, one of the documents
L 7	relied upon had this to say
L 8	MR. NILES: Gerry, I want to just tell you
L 9	we've got one more person waiting to speak.
20	GERRY POLLET: Okay. Unexpected high
21	migration of plutonium in the past suggests possible
22	unexpected exposures in the future. Plutonium
23	americium have migrated to unexpected depths due to
24	primarily to the unique features of the organic
25	wastes disposed. The only way to protect the

```
1
   groundwater, the only way to achieve protection of
 2
   the groundwater is to retrieve.
                                      Thank you very
 3
   much.
 4
              MR. NILES:
                           I'm sorry, Gerry.
                                               I quess
 5
   that person changed their mind. So it's 9:30.
   guess we're about to lose our room.
 6
                                           Thank you
 7
   again, very much, for coming. We appreciate it
 8
   greatly.
 9
              (Whereupon, public meeting concluded at
10
   9:33 p.m.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, Kimberly R. McLain, do hereby certify that
4	to the Rules of Civil Procedure, the witness named herein
5	appeared before me at the time and place set forth in the
6	caption herein; that at the said time and place, I
7	in stenotype all testimony adduced and other oral
8	proceedings had in the foregoing matter; and that the
9	foregoing transcript pages constitute a full, true and
10	correct record of such testimony adduced and oral
11	had and of the whole thereof.
12	
13	IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this
14	29th day of July, 2011.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	/Signed December 2, 2012
21	Kimberly R. McLain Commission Expiration
22	
23	
24	
25	

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NI	RC File # 14250-4	Page 519
	square	508:1	463:15	431:14
	419:2	514:13	20,000	200-PW-3
-	110.17	511.25		

\$	square	508:1	463:15	431:14
\$9,000	419:2	514:13	20,000	200-PW-3
485:5	419:17	514:25	462:18	434:5
5-	419:17	1949	515:6	
1	419:18	460:15	200 424:21	2011 407:3
1 411:19	482:3	1959	424:21	507:21 508:14
419:15	110	494:12	424:22	508:17
1,000	427:7		425:1	
482:2	485:11	1960s	426:4	2015
	12 434:7	474 : 4	427:24	414:10
1.006	459:18	1972	431:16	460:6
459:19	12,000	460:16	431:21	2039 451:8
10 434:7	447:6	1976	434:21	2050
441:11	447:6	470:24	456:22	451:11
447:4	509:5	1977	475 : 22	21 408:18
458:9		514:10	477:3	
458:9	13 442:14		482:19	22 420:15
10,000	14,000	1979	2000	23,000
416:14	442:15	494:11	466:14	461:4
462:18	14-month-	1980s	507:3	493:5
462:20	old	514:15	2001	230,000
463:19	511:23	1989	474:15	461:4
479:1	15	481:12	507:20	493:6
489:12	426:19	1990s	2002 494:9	23rd
516:5	431:7	427:12		508:16
100	434:9	1990's	2004 515:2	508:19
427:7	436:14	474:17	515:5	24,000
433:9	441:24		2006	441:9
440:3	476:12	19th	472:11	481:23
475:22	476:18	508:14	474:15	492:8
485:11 499:3	150 515:25		494:10	513:6
503:3	1600	2	507:20	240
515:25	431:18	2 490:19	507:22	433:9
	460:19	490:25	200-CW	481:24
100,000		2.2 460:4	412:11	
441:25	18 443:9	2.5 458:9	200-CW-5	240,000
100-year	476:2	20 421:5	428:17	441:12 481:24
503:2	477:23	434:7	200-PW-1	481:24 494:21
10-	488:18 491:12	438:5	412:12	434:41

(800) 528-3335 Naegeli Reporting.com

Public Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011	NRC File # 14250-4	Page
-----------------------------	---------------	--------------------	------

Public N	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 520
25 426:20	416:14	7:00 407:4	516:15	512:13
2500 418:8	40 421:5	70 414:16	absolutely	accountabi
27 407:3	431:4	70s	465:8	lity
505:25	464:9	472:4	484:3	463:10
	486:20	474:18	503:12	496:19
28 428:1	4200 429:3		509:3	496:21
2900	43 E1E.O	77 470:24	512:14	511:9
457:24	43 515:3		512:21	accountabl
458:2	45 490:11	8	accept	es
458:9		800 420:15	438:22	460:14
	5	450:6	441:15	
3	5 411:20	80s 474:18	468:25	accurate
3 408:20	412:12		acceptable	473:12 474:6
411:19	50 463:9	9	495:21	474:7
412:12	471:18	9:30		
426:5	499:2	468:10	access	achievable
431:14	500-mile	517:5	420:3	419:21
452:6	506:9	9:33	430:6	achieve
3,000		517:10	447:24	413:7
450:8	500-year	100	457:10	414:19
513:1	503:4	90 471:16	516:13	415:8
513:4	50s 472:4		accident	415:9
3.6 460:16	53 446:14	A	495:12	415:11
		ability	500:10	420:13
30 421:5	550,000	479:14	accommodat	514:8
431:4	443:11	able 420:3	e 451:16	514:9
438:17	586 413:16	421:4	451:19	515:22
463:15		427:5	516:15	515:23
470:23 490:11	6	427:8	accordance	515:23
511:15	6 408:20	445:4	487:21	517:1
	411:19	460:25		acid 427:1
300 490:20	412:13	463:14	according	acidic
490:25	426:5	463:20	447:17	427:1
35	431:14	483:20	462:11	
457:25	431:15	489:11	479:7 482:17	acknowledg
485:23	433:25	491:5		e 437:8
	452 : 7	491:6	accordingl	acronym
4	60 480:17	493:3	y 425:7	430:9
4,000		513:7	account	across
416:6	7	516:11	489:6	426:12
				All

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 521
430:23	423:3	452:7	afterwards	491:24
486:24	427:10	483:24	451:13	aired
487:4	429:5	501:8	503:20	499:19
act 427:14	429:11	adequately	against	
473:15	429:12	510:1		alive
514:11	430:2		502:4	504:17
515:1	433:5	adhere	509:5	allI
	435:16	464:2	age 467:22	513:13
action	444:10	adjudicate	500:18	allow
423:3	447:14	490:15	agencies	430:12
429:24	452:25	administra	444:15	454:13
488:12	453:12	tion	480:13	454:15
actions	454:16	467:19	501:4	
477:15	457:3			allowed
active	466:6	adults	agency	427:2
423:11	472:21	504:24	409:22	454:11
447:22	477:15	advancemen	424:14	486:12
502:6	480:23	t 483:5	454:8	allows
	498:18		465:25	428:7
actively	498:19	advice	agenda	454:11
448:4	499:5	440:16	411:22	455:7
448:5	ad 455:25	advised	466:22	455:9
502:9		440:23	ago 412:24	alone
activist	add 448:13	advisory	422:11	417:9
494:25	501:16	439:8	435:22	
activities	515:6	440:17	437:9	443:3
425:15	additional	440:18	442:15	already
425 : 15 425 : 23	492:17	440:18	468:21	411:22
	492:23	440:23	508:19	417:16
activity	address	444:16	513:2	426:3
414:25	425:15	487:21	513:5	428:18
423:12	427:12			441:5
431:10	427:12	advocated	agreement	441:7
actual	484:17	478:9	435:6	453:5
423:5	509:13	affect	450 : 15	453:6
423:10		452 : 24	ahead	457:12
actual1	addressed	455:11	428:11	466:18
actually	507:5	470:7	466:10	481:20
412:23	adds	afford	489:7	485:22
413:21	100 00		489.8	507:14

503:22



492:23

adequate

422:13

422:17

(800) 528-3335 Naegeli Řeporting.com

489:8

air 413:19

507:14

507:15

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 522
511:8	439:15	514:20	411:9	anywhere
511:10	487:23	animal	answers	417:6
alternativ	496:15	476:15	411:9	appalled
е	513:20	508:1	464:8	505:5
422:9	American	animals	anticipati	
422:16	502:11	475 : 16	ng 446:7	appears 488:15
436:10	Americans	475:19	480:19	No. 20 Sept. 10 Sept.
439:3	492:4	476:10		applaud
440:25	100000000000000000000000000000000000000		antidote	443:22
455:17	americium	annual	489:3	applied
490:10	426:16	423:10	anti-	458:9
alternativ	429:22	472:13	nuclear	476:24
The second secon	432:9	annually	494:25	485:21
es 422:8	434:19	423:8		
422:9	453:16	423:9	anybody	apply
428:12	516:23	474:23	408:21	433:5
429:23	amongst	475:2	499:10	434:3
431:5	416:13		anyhow	516:2
431:6		anomaly	483:1	appreciate
431:25	amount	429:15	anymore	407:21
432:4	429:17	anothers	414:16	410:6
432:14	470:18	442:24	429:6	494:15
433:14	473:16	answer		516:13
433:15	473:17	408:10	anyone	517:7
435:25	500:21	412:2	426:5	approach
436:3	amounts	439:2	502:25	412:5
443:8	437:22	445:2	anything	426:12
444:1	440:22	450:1	414:16	436:16
am	analysis	454:14	416:21	437:24
424:14	443:14	461:15	419:2	437.24
483:14	450:17	465:13	461:14	442:4
488:7	457:2	468:16	466:12	478:9
494:23	50.00	468:17	477:17	478:14
506:13	analyze	469:14	485:25	479:18
506:25	422:23	470:11	486:6	479:18
amended	ancestors	470:11	486:8	482:22
514:10	484:21	470:25	490:17	483:14
1000	and/or	472:8	493:21	
amendment	486:2	475:5	496:23	arbitrary
515:1	The state of the s	483:13		485:18
America	angry	5-2	anyway	area
	511:18	answering	488:18	

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 523
413:12	425:4	502:1	Associatio	407:10
413:14	427:24	504:5	n 484:16	407:12
413:16	431:6	ares 412:8	assume	407:15
413:17	431:16		441:15	410:23
413:18	431:16	argument	442:24	412:6
413:18	433:21	438:12		412:7
413:21	454:24	arguments	assumption	416:6
413:25	456:22	495:20	438:3	433:1
414:1	456:23	arise	441:14	433:3
414:4	463:3	483:7	441:22	435:13
414:7	463:13		442:1	445:14
414:10	474:2	armored	442:3	445:24
414:20	478:15	477 : 6	442:11	446:3
414:21	483:12	Army 511:5	443:3	446:6
414:22	489:18	articulate	461:3	449:11
414:23	491:5	512:3	478:20	451:14
415:4	491:6		493:2	451:20
415:5	493:5	artists	assumption	452:9
415:7	areas	498:17	s	453:5
415:10	413:5	498:18	441:5	453:10
415:11	413:15	499:9	444:2	453:21
415:16	413:24	499:20	454:12	455:6
415:18	414:2	aspect	505:7	455:21
415:19	415:4	408:12	assurances	456:9
416:25	415:20	assess	511:7	456:12
417:7	417:3	462:7		457 : 6
417:9	417:15	516:11	astonishin	458:23
417:18	420:15		gly	459:12
418:2	420:15	assessment	516:2	459:14
418:15	421:15	474:24	atmosphere	463:8
418:25	424:10	485:2	486:3	464:19
419:19	424:20	485:8	atomic	464:24
419:23	428:16	508:8	498:16	465:3
420:6	428:16	assigned	499:20	465:16
420:7	430:18	420:2		466:3
421:23	452:5	assistant	attention	466:7
424:21	478:22	410:18	502:25	467:6
424:22	485:4	439:11	503:8	467:10
424:23	492:16	associated	attitude	467:13
424:24	495:10		443:21	467:25
425:1	aren't	433:20	audience	468:14
	,	4		

basically

413:20

417:15

422:23

423:19

430:11



452:11

514:11

407:17

430:16

banning

barely

barrier

500:24

436:23

461:6

В

away

(800) 528-3335 Naegeli Reporting.com

499:13

510:22

510:23

503:19

bed 428:6

becomes

belongs

484:3

benchmark

430:3

beneath

Public Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011	NRC File # 14250-4	Page 525

Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 525
Bertish	bit	450:21	bouncing	408:4
484:14	408:4	460:24	487:10	421:11
484:15	408:15	482:6	bound	450:4
best	408:24	487:22	483:22	briefs
416:11	409:23	492:12	bounds	418:19
458:25	418:3	body	459:23	bring
459:20	437:12	500:23	50 50 50 50 50 50 50	440:20
462:9	446:10	bombs	Boy 407:6	444:5
462:9	456:18	514:19	boys	457:4
466:23	465:23		500:17	475:16
485:9	498:13	book	breach	483:7
511:21	508:14	502:22	499:11	500:12
512:15	Blah 507:8	booming	54 SE SE SE SE SE SE	510:19
512:16	blah-	445:6	break	514:5
betrayal	blah	bore	408:14	bringing
496:23	507:9	448:15	425:6	436:14
better	100	472:20	496:4	445:18
407:11	blast	473:5	502:23	472:23
424:12	436:22	473:10	breaking	495:4
479:4	blending	473:13	442:15	
479:4	482:20	474:14	468:11	broad
489:19	blockade	bored	breaks	440:17
491:14	502:4	486:2	409:24	broken
beyond	blowing	487:1	501:25	424:20
465:22	476:17	boring	breathing	brought
495:10	blown	473:7	412:25	457:20
and the second second	418:15	2000	491:19	470:21
bias 450:24		born 505:23	brief	495:4
Acres dell'acres dell'	Bluffs	511:15	411:3	brown
billion	442:20		411:14	414:23
459:11	blunt	bottom	411:15	415:5
459:18	440:12	429:18	412:5	415:6
460:3	board	448:3	412:9	buck
460:4	439:8	458:7	417:12	495:17
497:19	440:17	498:14	418:4	
biological	440:18	bottomless	428:25	budget
476:4	440:19	467:23	481:10	442:4
bison	440:23	bought	487:12	458:25 459:1
442:18	443:16	456:22	494:5	459:10
	444:16		briefly	400.10

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 526
459:12		482:20	504:7	448:17
459:17	C	caps	cases	450:6
460:3	C-1A	441:15	474:12	471:10
462:12	472:10	Account of Selection (Selection (478:23
497:23	Cadillac	capture	Castle	483:12
budgets	486:23	460:10	483:17	493:4
459 : 10	calculated	460:11	483:17	493:16
459:20		captured	cataclysmi	century
459:23	457:5	460:7	c 485:14	481:14
463:12	calculatin	captures	catch	484:21
	g 471:25	497:21	429:16	
build	California		Accessed the Spinessed St.	CERCLA
484:22	486:16	carbon	catty-	421:11
building	487:3	427:1	corner	423:6
417:5	487:7	427:6	430:23	423:16
418:6	2000 200 2000	427:9	cause	429:24
489:21	calmly	427:19	506:6	461:14
502:9	514:22	432:9	caused	462:16
built	camels	432:21	488:10	462:23
484:24	442:18	432:24		474:19
486:6	cannister	453:12	causes	493:10
506:2	446:25	516:1	486:4	493:11
bulk 438:1	cannisters	card 411:1	caveat	510:12
438:7	447:1	care	438:18	certainly
	447:3	429:21	centimeter	464:15
bunch		498:11	s 470:24	480:14
420:4	cap	503:23		492:7
459 : 2	477:6	509:24	central	certainty
burial	477:9	511 : 7	410:18	487:5
419:8	477:17	carried	414:6	certified
420:4	507:10	491:23	414:23 414:24	448:2
buried	capacity		414:24	cesium
448:15	449:14	carry	415:7	409:20
burst	451:6	489:12	417:14	409:20
487:12	451:6	492:3	417:14	414:13
	451:7	492:10	417:13	425:1
bury 485:1	451:25	case	425:20	429:22
buy 507:15	452:3	457 : 13	431:16	429:22 432:1
buying	capping	480:1	442:8	436:13
505:6	471:6	487:10	446:15	437:14
000.0		502.7		



478:18

(800) 528-3335 Naegeli Řeporting.com

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 527
438:8	437:8	515:4	504:5	502:17
438:11	455:25	cheaper	512:1	claim
438:14	470:5	443:7	512:22	493:16
438:21	470:20	503:18	513:19	
440:23	494:13	515:9	children's	clarify
444:5	496:4		500:11	447:9
444:6	501:17	cheapest		448:9
482:20	503:5	515 : 15	Chim	457:19
488:3	changed	check	499:20	465:22
492:21	422:17	464:7	choice	clarifying
497:8	480:5	499:18	456:20	445:1
498:11	480:7	checking	464:12	445:11
500:24	511:23	465:3	511:16	466:3
501:13	513:23	483:25	choices	466:8
505:13	517:5		456:19	468:13
508:11	1000	chemical		468:19
516:7	changes	448:21	choose	469:16
516:11	423:2	515:8	513:10	clarity
cesium-137	503:24	chemicals	chose	480:15
427:22	changing	460:17	433:14	Class
432:11	506:4	460:19	Chris	
434:5	characteri	491:21	488:5	445:23 448:18
Challenge	zation	505:14	488:5	448:19
489:17	473:10	506:7	chromium	440:19
	473:11	508:12	469:23	515:12
challenges	characteri	515:19		
413:8	ze 421:3	chemistry	Chuck	clean
challengin	460:22	437:19	439:11	414:14
g 499:16	472:16	438:13	460:23	414:17
chance	472:16	Chernobyl	460:23	414:18
413:1	510:18	500:10	492:11	433:21
413:2		500:10	492:11	444:18
418:13	characteri	500:15	493:24	453:21
428:22	zing	The second of the second of the second	cite 458:5	454:4
442:21	510:1	child	458:6	482:21
506:5	charge	500:22	citizen	484:8
506:11	430:25	children	496:14	488:8
514:4	charges	492:9		495:5
	514:16	500:13	citizens	497:16
change	1907	500:14	481:11	503:7
436:10	cheap	500:18	483:1	507:13

Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 528
508:25	454:9	509:18	color	467:14
514:10	456:18	climate	500:19	497:18
514:25	456:20	441:24	colors	Comfort
cleaned	456:21	443:1	425:10	504:10
414:3	456:25	470:5	Columbia	504:10
482:12	457:22	496:4	413:13	comfortabl
484:9	458:2	501:17	437:2	e
490:9	462:1	503:5	437.2	481 : 7
492:1	481:12	503:9	439:4	491:10
492:1	481:25	503:10	442:13	
497:15	482:6	close	442:14	coming
508:13	483:5	413:23	442:16	407:8
508:23	483:7	478:6	442:21	407:20
cleaning	483:15	500:4	442:25	411:16
466:18	485:17	Security and Security Security	457:25	413:13
488:13	485:20	closed	460:24	434:10
501:15	496:13	449:9	481:16	445:25
504:9	497:19	close-	481:21	446:1
511:11	501:19	out	481:23	448:12
	503:14	414:10	482:4	453:18
cleanup	503:19	closer	487:22	463:4
407:23	503:21	425:3	490:4	470:9
408:1	504:11		492:12	472:19
412:5	504:20	closure	506:7	476:15
412:18	505:7	451:10	507:14	491:7
412:21	506:13 507:9	code	507:18	491:15
413:4	510:6	411:21		510:24
413:12	510:18	coffin	column	513:18
413:24 414:1	515:25	496:20	427:3	517:7
414:1			433:13	comment
415:3	clear	cold	476:19	408:10
417:20	469:11	425:23	combinatio	412:23
417:24	512:8	502:7	n	413:1
419:23	512:9	504:4	431:5	413:11
426:12	515:13	collect	433:14	416:22
443:19	clearly	428:2	comes	422:10
443:19	429:15	collected	423:12	422:11
449:16	457:21	426:9	435:17	422:14
450:3	482:5		435:18	422:15
450:14	509:10	college 491:9	459:17	422:24
	509:10	491:9	461:18	435:10



(800) 528-3335 NaegeliReporting.com

Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 529
435:14	486:10	504:11	440:10	494:19
439:14	494:16	506:13	concept	confronted
444:2	494:21	completely	415:6	496:9
445:3	513:15	492:1	419:14	
449:8	commission	508:12		confused
449:9	ing	Completion	concern	447:13
464:6	418:9	412:18	437:12	confusing
464:10			441:19	415:18
464:14	commitment	complex	480:4	500:6
464:16	416:3	414:1	511:1	confusion
465:12	420:19	415:3	concerned	453 : 22
465:17	443:17	447:24	440:21	
465:21	463:6	472 : 18	494:6	congress
466:1	467:24	complicate	510:12	451:7
475:6	480:24	d 408:16	510:20	502 : 2
480:16	committed	464:7	concerning	congressio
480:19	469:15		497:5	nal
483:15	committee	Comprehens	concerns	497:17
494:5	497:23	ive	412:1	connect
516:14		417 : 2	437:21	499:11
comments	common	compromise		499:12
408:5	430:9	496:12	concise	
411:5	communicat	compromise	408:8	connected
411:7	e 513:7	d 481:14	concluded	439:19
411:24	communicat		517:9	consensus
435:2	ion	computer	conclusion	440:16
435:3	513:4	498:13	443:3	consequenc
435:5		computers		es 500:9
435:6	company	488:21	conclusion	503:20
436:8	486:17	concentrat	s 440:13	
436:25	486:18	ion	concrete	conservanc
438:23	486:23	434:24	434:16	y 490:24
444:1	487:7	440:3	condensate	494:24
450:17	comparable	440:4	429:9	495:3
451:2	492:2	453:15		conservati
465:7	competing		429:13	on 439:6
466:21	418:4	concentrat	condense	conservati
475:9		ions	432:22	ve
480:3	complete	433:17	confidence	490:23
481:4	413:24	433:19	497:4	
481:10	417:20	438:2		conserved
			confront	



Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 530
432:2	462:4	424:25	492:15	ial
consider	462:5	425:1	492:18	440:15
435:5	construct	425:13	510:19	convention
455:14	433:22	425:16	514:12	s 509:13
455:14	containing	425:17	516:4	
475:11	434:18	427:2	continued	conversati
478:10		427:12	466:14	on
485:24	contaminan	427:20	515:2	511:20
considerat	ts	441:23	continues	511:21
ion	430:13	472:25	502:17	convoluted
470:4	430:18	475:19		468:17
470:4	438:14	475:25	continuing	cooling
501:17	475:14	481:13	433:15	411:19
	482:15	482:19	481:22	429:8
considerat	491:25	495:11	484:1	
ions	503:16	495:16	continuous	copies
493:12	contaminat	Contaminat	415:23	438:24
497:1	e 448:25	ion's	442:5	copy 437:4
considered	515:19	429:17	456:15	corner
417:4	516:4	content	control	438:25
465:7	contaminat	480:8	438:19	correct
476:25	ed 409:4	continuall	442:2	453:7
considerin	409:8	У	442:7	460:13
g 509:23	409:18	483:7	457:10	468:22
consistent	409:19	498:6	483:20	472:4
450:18	425:14	166	496:6	corrected
451:2	426:16	continue	512:13	449:2
	433:18	417:19	controlled	
consistent	433:20	417:21	420:1	correctly
ly	482:21	420:19	486:9	507:13
407:21	485:4	420:21	controllin	corridor
constituen	503:19	427:17	g 430:6	414:6
ts 453:1	contaminat	427:19	_	414:7
453:16	es 482:3	427:20	controls	415:9
473:8		463:12 464:18	430:5	452:10
476:22	contaminat		458:15	cost 424:2
constraine	ing	466:17 466:19	463:6	424:4
d 468:25	491:22	474:15	477:11	443:10
	contaminat	480:10	477:19	461:17
constraint	ion	483:25	controvers	461:18
s		403.23		101.10

Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 531
473:1	courageous	482:17	cut 464:23	512:6
473:2	498:18	cribs	CW	512:7
477:22	498:21	426:2	408:23	512:10
478:4	course	472:10	411:20	date 451:8
483:3	423:10	criteria	CW-200-5	451:10
485:13	436:18	423:17	431:5	daughter
491:11	448:7	423:18	[20] 42 [2029 68 (30)	509:17
492:23	court	423:19	CW-3	
501:2	465:5	436:5	431:17	daughters
cost-		436:7	CW-5	459:4
effectiv	cover		408:20	day 467:22
e 419:23	430:5	critical	431:22	479:3
costs	432:15	476:13	494:7	512:7
415:12	432:16	crops	494:10	days
415:15	434:8	481:17		481:25
473:17	436:15	cubed	D	490:11
497:5	covered	447:20	damn	490:12
514:9	487:2	447:21	514:17	deactivati
514:9	covering	cubic	Dan	The second secon
514:19	491:24	488:22	437:1	on
514:19	crap 474:4		439:4	466:14
514:22	Crap 4/4:4	cue 407:7	439:5	dead 463:8
515:21	crappy	cultural	492:20	deadly
count	499:6	504:2		481 : 19
446:25	crazy	curious	dangerous	deal 469:2
447:6	510:9	428:23	441:13	495:23
	511:22	430:1	459 : 7	
country	created	1000	darker	dealing
506:2	511:18	current	415:5	425:12
506:8		451:10	data	488:22
couple	creating	507:5	421:20	debate
416:16	470:5	currently	426:9	440:20
434:14	creative	507:23	471:9	debates
439:9	497:11	custodians	471:23	440:7
439:22	creativity	420:11	472:3	
444:24	497:25	custodians	472:7	decade
446:3		No. 100	473:9	420:16
466:12	crew	hip	473:25	decades

419:5

416:25

crib

508:19

509:20

468:10

470:23

(800) 528-3335 Naegeli Řeporting.com

489:25

497:4

483:12

decay

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 532
481:25	462:11	421:7	451:19	477:19
December	462:11	424:6	485:12	DENNIS-EPA
418:10	463:23	427:13	default	433:8
decide	463:23	436:11	490:23	457 : 7
436:6	464:1	452:24	510:22	469:16
520 521 520	469:3	457:12	define	dense
decided	469:5	462:13	470:19	416:1
486:23	469:6	462:15	490:2	
509:4	469:20	467:20		department
deciding	470:14	474:10	defined	409:6
510:13	474:20	476 : 8	418:17	409:9
decision	476:13	479:10	419:11	409:21
420:15	476:24	485:1	477:16	410:19
420:15	476:25	503:18	definition	415:22
W - S. 27 S. 27 S. 28 S. 28	477:14	504:25	458:11	417:1
421:17	477:15	511:16	definition	417:8
421:18	479:2	decommissi		419:9
422:3	479:4	oned	s 439:22	420:2
422:4	479:11	507:2	degradatio	423:1
422:22	479:12	doon	n 501:8	437:16
423:2	479:13	deep	degree	437:17
423:17	479:21	421:20	450:3	438:18
427:17	484:17	426:17	450:14	440:13
435:7	493:12	427:3	450:23	441:7
435:8	494:21	433:1	482:14	442:6
435:15	495:3	433:2		443:18
435:17	495:25	433:6	demand	446:11
436:6	497:1	433:9	496:21	450:1
446:9	497:12	436:19	508:10	450:10
446:19	497:24	441:1	demanding	450 : 12
449:6	503:23	471:25	514:15	450:13
449:6	509:6	474:14	democracy	457:23
449:10	515:5	476:21	494:22	467:15
455:3	decisions	482:20		469:2
455:4	413:10	497:8	denial	481:10
455:18	418:18	503:15	488:10	482 : 7
455:19	419:23	deeper	488:10	482:18
455:20	420:14	430:14	488:15	492:13
455:24	420:16	431:22	489:3	502 : 4
456:3	420:17	438:4	Dennis	505 : 6
461:12	420:18	451:17	456:17	514 : 23
462:6				

Public Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27 2011	NDC Eilo # 14250 4	Page 533
I ublic ivity (VOL +) Taken on	July 21, 2011	14110 1 116 # 14230-4	i age 555

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 533
515:4	428:9	487:4	458:11	436:11
516:8	design	developmen	458:24	directed
Department	423:4	ts	460:19	455:4
s 502:21	456:6	486:21	465:19	
	Section Sectio		468:2	directly
depending	designed 429:11	diagrams	468:8	426:2
433:6	430:17	478 : 24	469:19	444:2
476 : 12	430:17	dialogue	498:22	director
depends	431:20	464:15	differentl	439:6
433:4		466:2	y 499:1	494:24
473:6	designing	481:3	difficult	dirt
473:6	501:13	die 489:11	441:14	472:19
473:7	desire	513:11	442:3	dirty
473:7	410:9	difference	442:24	428 : 5
492:3	desk 410:5	432:14	512:8	18. 18. 18. 18. 18. 18. 18. 18. 18. 18.
depicted		443:10		disagree
414:8	detail	454:15	difficulti	478:11
depiction	418:21	454:21	es 408:7	disagreeme
428:19	details	477:22	dig	nt
	497:13		409:7	437:18
depth	497:14	difference	409:10	478:12
426:19	detectable	s 408:22	409:11	disagrees
427:25	453:13	476 : 2	461:5	440:12
434:2 434:6	determine	different	463:9	
436:15	417:25	408:1	475:23	disappoint ed
451:17	471:24	408:18	476:11	50 A C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
451:19	479:25	409:2	480:8	496:10 506:14
485:9	- [17] A	413:5	492:15	
485:10	determined	415:17	498:10	disasters
488:1	421:18	415:20	505:13	501:18
488:2	436:4	416:18	507:24	disbursed
	448:7	419:24	508:1	428:5
depths	472:1	425:10	digging	discharge
427:7	485:11	426:24	441:1	426:1
516:23	devastatin	446:10	507:25	
describe	g 503:19	450:5	diligence	discharged
465:16	develop	454:19	482 : 13	426:1
describes	490:10	454:24 455:10	dimensiona	426:25
486:8	developmen	455:10	1 488:24	516 : 8
describing		458:8		discharges
describing	t 486:25	400.0	direct	

Public Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27 2011	NDC Eilo # 14250 4	Page 534
rubile ivity (VOL 4) Taken on	July 21, 2011	NING 1 116 # 14250-4	1 age 334

Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 534
514:12	444:9	disturbing	490:21	D-o-w-e-
514:12	455:12	512:21	493:1	1-1
disconnect	482:16	ditch	493:3	410:25
488:11	495:22	429:6	507:19	DOWELL
498:6	496:11	ditches	DOE's	410:21
disconnect	dispose	428:19	459:12	410:25
ed	425:25	428:19	490:18	416:8
506:22	429:11	429:2	dollar	428:15
	430:8	429:3	497:3	433:2
discover	431:7	429:5		433:4
479:8	431:8	Secretary and American	dollars	433:11
492:17	431:8	diverge	443:11	445:22
discovered	431:20	442:10	460:4 461:25	446:1
482:8	432:18	divided	461:25 473:1	446:5
discretion	433:20	424:21	497:6	446:8
ary	434:2	doctor	497:19	447:11
443:20	440:25	488:9	500:21	448:19
443:23	487:24	document		449:2
discussed	493:7	412:15	done	449:21
417:16	515:11	412:17	421:22	451:5
431:13	515:15	412:19	425:11	451:18
	disposed	412:22	451:24	451:21
discussion	482:23	412:24	454:6 476:18	452:13
409:15	482:24	412:25	482:13	452:20
416:12	516:25	435:18	492:13	453:8 453:11
465:23	disposing	458:5	496:16	454:14
480:13	515:9	documentat	503:15	455:17
disease	515:10	ion	503:16	456:2
511:6	dispute	422 : 1	504:12	456:10
disk 457:6	458:14		512:20	456:14
457:7	disregarde	documented	door	458:1
dismaying	d 485:2	421:23	448:23	458:11
503:5		421:24		459:9
Total and seed of the seed of	disruptive	421:25	Dowell	459:13
display 436:7	502:15	documents	410:20	459:16
	disservice	482:19	410:25	460:2
disposal	502:17	515:13	493:1	460:13
419:7	distribute	516:16	493:10 513:21	461:9
419:10	s 428:7	DOE 443:15	513:21 514:7	463:11
431:19		478:10	J14: /	465:8
	I .			I-

(800) 528-3335 NaegeliReporting.com

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 535
465:10	514:8	514:24	489:22	486:13
465:14	515:22	during	506:3	effect
467:3	drive	411:25	506:3	430:3
467:8	413:21	425:23	earthquake	461:18
467:12	424:4	425:23	s 470:10	479:18
467:16	430:13	426:9		
468:3	454:12	428:25	easily	effective
469:4		432:5	478:7	432:24
470:20	driven	444:24	East	441:16
472:9	432:11	492:25	424:22	471:5
472:15	460:8	494:8	424:25	479:16
473:6	462:12	511:4	425:1	489:25
473:21	drivers		427:24	effectivel
474:5	429:22	DVD 412:16	Eastern	y 453:3
474:23	432:9	DVDs 492:8	442:17	effectiven
476:3	drives	Dvija	442:19	ess
476:7	461:15	484:14		417:24
477:10	462:6	484:14	Ecology	420:20
477:25	1000 1000 1000	Sec. 2012	413:19	420:21
478:13	driving	dying	413:19	423:7
479:22	491:1	500:20	419:9	423:7
downstream	491:2	500:22	422:25	462:24
453:7	drop 438:2	1	450:1	462:25
453:9	due 482:13	E	450:12	463:1
Downwinder	516:23	earlier	450:13	464:1
		422:19	450:24	476:9
s 511:3	dug 421:20	470:17	505:6	
drawing	444:7	early	505:12	effects
443:16	449:14	427 : 12	508:10	452:25
drawn-	dump 432:8	481:25	economic	490:3
out	466:15	508:14	503:25	490:4
464:8	466:17	earth	economics	efficientl
	466:19	487:17	503:17	y 431:21
drill	466:20	488:7		effort
473:13	508:18	491:18	educate	462:9
drinking	515:2	504:13	489:10	483:16
414:19	dumped	504:16	490:2	505:10
414:20	414:2	504:17	501:24	
415:8	429:12	512:24	educationa	efforts
415:9	466:18		1 435:23	414:9
453:14	dumping	earthquake	eerily	eight
	damping			

Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 536
476:18	424:13	467:15	environmen	505:12
eight-	emotion	469:3	t 415:24	507:10
year-old	506:15	481:11	416:5	507:19
509:17	506:21	482:7	416:11	508:10
	500 500 500 500 500	490:10	416:23	516:14
EIS 452:17	empty	501:23	420:12	EPA's
471:9	409:12	501:25	436:2	424:14
478:24	Emy 421:10	502:4	455:1	436:12
either	424:9	502:21	461:24	
431:9	428:18	502:23	471:6	equal
496:13	431:15	514:23	478:18	490:17
elaborate	435:12	515:4	479:24	ERDF 419:7
470:14	436:21	516:8	480:10	444:9
	450:21	Energy's	496:16	444:10
electrodes	Emy's	410:19	503:20	492:22
430:23	450:11	450:10	505:16	Eric
430:24		482:18	514:20	489:16
element	encourage	492:14	environmen	489:16
469:15	411:25		tal	550
476:14	502:22	engage	409:21	especially
481:20	encouraged	499:6	419:6	407:20
elements	505:4	engineered	424:13	496:2
423:22	encouragin	430:10	444:13	501:4
	q 488:14	430:11	444:0	essence
else		431:19		456:23
439:18	energy	431:20	454:7 471:9	establishe
460:12	409:6	engineerin	501:7	d 492:16
468:1	409:10	g 423:25	According to the control of the cont	
479:7	409:21	432:17	503:25	estimate
493:22	415:22	456:6	EPA 416:24	446:23
494:5	417:1	1000	420:19	478:6
514:2	417:8	enhance	422:25	estimated
515:10	423:1	432:16	435:24	443:11
email	437:16	434:8	436:1	estimates
435:5	437:17	ensure	436:16	
ombraco	438:18	434:9	450:10	451:10
embrace	440:13	entered	450:20	451:14
502:11	441:7	481:20	450 : 22	493:14
embraced	442:6		456:17	etcetera
502:8	443:18	entity	462:24	455:16
Emerald	446:11	504:17	470:4	468:23
	157.23		501 • 4	



(800) 528-3335 NaegeliReporting.com

Public Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011	NRC File # 14250-4	Page 5
		102 2 2 2 2 W 1 1 2 2 2 2 1 1	<u> </u>

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 537
eternity	484:20	488:1	484:4	445:16
516:3	484:23	491:13	expectatio	445:19
euphemism	everyone	excellent	n 483:19	exposed
505:3	477:11	413:9	expecting	458:16
evacuate	480:22	except	435:8	491:21
433:16	494:5	467:1	446:7	exposure
495:10	497:15	exchange	459:23	458:15
evacuation	everything	491:10	459:25	458:19
482:16	421:22		460:6	495:6
	424:4	exciting	474:2	500:9
evaluate	460:12	418:10	expense	exposures
469:12	465:6	422:20	482:25	516:22
evaluates	466:25	489:1	491:11	
422:7	483:18	excuse	100 to 10	extended
evaluating	508:12	428:6	expensive	443:16
411:8	everywhere	execute	410:11	451:16
472:25	503:10	412:21	441:2	516:15
11 Sec. 10	503:11	423:3	484:2	extending
evaluation	evidenced	Executive	497:3	435:9
494:1	481:21		514:17	451:9
evaporate		494:24	experience	extension
430:12	exact	exist	412:6	451:9
evapotrans	428:21	460:20	442:22	extensive
piration	451:21	existed	experience	454:25
430:16	exactly	416:15	d 511:9	
433:22	413:3	existing	experienci	extent
434:4	421:12	430:4	ng 496:3	473:15
441:17	462:2	432:15		479:1
evening	490:6	432:16	expert	extracting
407:6	example	434:8	500:6	432:21
494:16	431:3	448:23	500:20	extraction
495:20	469:18	exists	explain	427:11
event	494:22	441:24	409:23	427:16
476:14	excavate	446:15	450:4	432:19
	433:17		456:17	433:16
everybody	437:25	expanded	509:16	516:3
407:6	excavating	451:18	export	extreme
407:19	434:10	expect	445:20	493:15
410:21		446:18	exporting	extremely
465:2	excavation	459:19		Cr cr ewer y

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 538
448:14	494:19	faster	489:19	476:2
448:22	495:7	427:14	489:24	476:12
491:25	495:9	fathom	494:17	476:19
eye 419:12	502:22	457:10	feeling	477:22
7 113,113	factored		488:12	477:23
F	503:7	fault		478:3
face 413:8		506:3	feet	478:3
496:5	factors	favor	419:17	480:6
496:8	469:1	450:14	419:18	482:16
503:25	failed	fear	426:19	482:19
504:4	441:19	488:10	426:21	485:11
	485:3	489:2	427:7	488:18
faced	failing	489:3	428:1	488:18
498:23	420:24		429:3	491:12
faces	The second state of the second state of	feasibilit	431:4	492:15
509:13	fairly	У	431:7	493:13
facilities	427:25	422:6	433:9	500:23
418:7	429:19	424:1	433:10	503:14
425:21	478:6	457:8	433:18	504:12
502:10	Fairview	516:12	433:19	504:18
	486:23	feature	434:7	507:24
facility	fall 486:7	477:4	434:7	507:25
419:7		features	434:9	508:2
444:9	falls	516:24	438:1	508:5
447:2	408:19		438:2	509:10
449:12	families	federal	438:4	511:22
492:22	512:23	457:14	438:4	Feldman
fact	family	486:17	438:5	498:4
417:21	495:2	501:3	438:5 443:6	498:4
420:20	506:1	514:10	443:0	fence
427:5		514:18	443:9	463:2
439:10	fancy	feedback	443:10	489:9
439:12	430:21	410:8	443:12	Indiana and Anna Anna
449:3	farming	410:15	447:4	fencing
452:5	504:12	480:14	447:4	475:12
456 : 22	farms	494:2	451:16	475:21
463:24	419:5	feel 413:1	470:22	476:1
479:5	1 (1 a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	421:8	470:22	fertilizer
482:12	fast 421:7	422:2	470:23	s 438:20
490:25	430:1	467:18	472:20	field
494:10	506:21	481:6	476:2	
		101.0	₹/0.2	430:25

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 539
474:14	fine 437:7	505:23	491:3	484:23
502:24	490:20	five	497:5	form 410:5
504:14	finishing	409:19	folks	432:21
504:16	429:9	414:9	465:14	480:19
fields	432:6	423:6	493:25	495:21
431:3	fires	424:3	498:2	formal
fight	447:24	431:13	505:20	408:10
483:5	to the second se	438:5	513:15	408:19
figure	firm 512:6	461:16	food 485:4	435:19
445:15	512:6	462:12	foolish	445:2
497:2	first	469:1	483:1	464:5
497:10	410:17	fix 512:16		464:13
498:24	428:20	512 : 17	foot	464:16
513:3	437:7	513:8	436:14	464:21
513:5	439:10	flawed	483:23	465:12
	440:9	479:10	492 : 16	465:17
fill 410:6	441:6	479:11	footprint	466:1
433:22	449:22	flaws	413:22	480:16
449:12 474:8	449:22	495:25	414:4	forms
474:8	449:23		414:11	494:2
	451:5 459:9	flood	414:18	513:4
filled	466:13	442:23	418:14	forward
429:6	476:3	462:20	418:16	483:6
494:1	476:12	489:18	419:11	489:14
final	476:12	floods	419:14	
411:15	480:4	442:15	force	fossils
412:24	484:19	470:7	491:1	442:18
455:4	488:6	floored	491:2	fouled
finally	515:17	509:5	forced	504:8
516:11	fiscal	flowing	469:2	foundation
financial	459:18	453:6	foreclosur	494:24
476:1		453:9	e 451:8	495:3
	fish 417:4	489:1		foundation
finding 473:25	420:1	flume	foreseeabl	s 487:2
	507:15	473:15	e 420 : 9	fourth
findings	fission		420:9	411:14
482:18	459:2	flush	500 Sec. 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 -	
finds	459:3	428:4	forever	frame
493:6	Fitzgerald	focus	440:19	413:9 441:4
	505:22	414:8	forgot	441:4

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 540
455:8	fully	496:18	450:15	448:20
455:13	431:22	496:22	478:12	452:17
456:9	496:13	496:24	502:1	452:18
456:12	496:15	500:25	generated	452:19
456:14	501:15	505:1	425:24	453:1
462:21	512:11	512:2	493:20	454:3
frames	funding	512:23	511:6	454:6
455:10	493:11	516:22		454:16
458:20		futuristic	generates	457:19
495:24	fusion	510:3	422:7	458:1
	502:7	310.3	generation	458:4
Framework	future	G	s	458:13
412:19	411:10		424:7	465:5
free 413:1	411:11	gallons	489:7	471:8
friends	418:1	418:8	489:8	478:24
489:15	420:7	425:24	489:10	513:16
	420:9	446:14	489 : 12	513:17
front	420:16	460:17	489:13	516:18
428:20	427:21	gaps	489:14	516:20
445:13	439:19	443:14	493:21	517:4
486:4	441:24	garbage-	495:17	Gerry's
503:9	462:22	type	496:18	418:4
Frontline	463:2	414:3	496:24	
498:16	463:17		503:13	gets
499:19	463:18	Garbin	504:2	408:15
frost	463:21	501:21	512:2	416:18
The second secon	463:21	501:21		438:1
485:25	479:8	gas 486:15	geological	452:14
Fuji	479:20	486:19	442:13	452:25
498:20	482:25	486:20	442:22	453:3
Fukushima	483:9	gather	geology	455:4
495:4	485:15	421:16	452:4	457:4
495:5	486:13	100	geometric	463:18
498:20	487:5	general	419:1	481:2
499:2	487:6	413:15		490:3
	491:7	415:15	geometry	512:20
full	491:8	417:4	432:1	getting
433:11	491:15	419:25	Gerry	414:5
433:12	493:17	486:3	410:3	415:14
472:22	493:20	generally	411:2	415:14
491:12	495:16	428:9	444:15	418:13
512:9			448:9	

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 541
444:9	431:1	502:11	515:12	449:18
453:22	globally	514:10	greatest	452:9
471:14	503:1	514:18	491:11	469:21
473:16	The second secon	gram 440:3		481:22
473:17	goals	457:24	greatly	491:23
475:19	413:3	458:3	517:8	515:19
491:22	413:7		Greek	516:4
496:7	God's	grandchild	502:8	517:1
ghost-like	506:2	ren	green	517:2
500:22	506:8	492:9	413:16	group
	gone	graph		408:23
girl	460:18	425:19	ground	408:23
500:11	460:18	454:16	415:14	409:5
girls	Gorge		423:13	409:5
500:17	505:25	graphic	426:1	409:9
	507:18	413:15	426:18	
given	gorgeous	Grater	426:19	411:14
438:16	407:20	448:19	428:5	425:7
470:5		gravel	429:17	426:13
470:6	go-round	428:6	430:13	427:22
490:18	480:22	428:6	431:18	427:23
503:8	gotten		431:23	433:14
513:22	465:22	great	432:20	433:25
gives	465:23	438:2	432:23	434:6
410:7	480:15	465:24	437:11	434:14
412:9	484:2	467:11	440:9	434:22
giving	government	480:13	469:11	434:23
435:22	413:6	481:16	472:22	447:14
465:19	415:22	487:25	476:6	500:11
The state of the s	416:15	494:17	476:16	grouped
glad	416:20	494:22	groundwate	426:9
490:12	454:5	495:23	r 417:17	groupings
510:14	457:14	496:1	417:17	409:2
glass	461:13	497:13	417.17	
430:22	462:19	greater	418:7	groups
448:5	486:14	440:3	425:14	426:10
448:6	486:17	445:22	423:14	437:6
glassifica	487:8	448:18	427:4	437:13
tion	493:6	448:21	430:14	grout
	499:15	449:5	430:14	434:20
430:22	502:9	491:13	438:16 448:25	grow
glassifies	302:9	491:13	440:23	920#

	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on		C File # 14250-4	Page 542
495:25	Н	handouts	448:11	506:4
496:1	hair	477 : 25	450:5	506:5
guarantee		hands	450:6	506:12
460:25	500:19	445:10	450:7	511:8
461:3	half	480:18	451:11	happened
461:7	424:21	487:13	453:10	414:25
490:19	447:4	498:1	454:20	415:1
490:25	471:18	505:19	457:12	425:20
491:5	471:19	509:21	460:5	428:9
493:3	471:20	Hanford	466:11	453:23
guard	471:22	407:23	468:17	467:21
493:8	481:14	407:25	481:9	474:22
	487:16		481:13	500:10
guess	493:14	408:15	482:4	511:10
445:4	497:19	408:19	482:6	hannons
448:25	507:9	412:4	485:23	happens
464:8	half-	412:18	487:21	430:22
509:22	life	413:17	488:14	485:1
517:4		415:1	489:17	485:14
517:6	438:17	417:6	491:19	hard
guide	440:2	417:7	495:13	457:10
481:22	481:23	417:19	500:4	467:12
	half-lives	423:8	501:18	468:16
guideline	441:11	424:19	506:2	469:15
412:17	HALISS	425:14	507:2	498:12
guides	487:18	425:20	508:18	514:21
412:19		432:5	511:4	harm 491:7
412:20	Hallis	437:20	514:13	491:15
guise	487:18	439:8	515:12	511:9
505:11	hallway	440:6	515:14	
	494:3	440:11	Hanford's	harmed
guy	hand	440:17	413:12	511:2
467:7	428:11	440:18	496:11	hates
467:8	464:4	440:23		477:12
guys		442:17	happen	haven't
444:14	hand-in-	442:20	421:6	451:24
475:11	hand	444:11	421:6	485:25
497:16	416:24	444:16	454:13	
	462:23	445:15	454:15	486:8 492:6
guy's	handling	445:17	490:19	492:6

445:25

446:2



506:20

507:3

handling

440:14

(800) 528-3335 Naegeli Řeporting.com

499:4

503:2

494:1

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 543
having	407:16	453:25	498:21	502:21
457:1	410:21	494:18	helps	highest
457:10	411:4	505:1	422:21	433:17
489:18	412:2	508:17		433:18
498:25	417:2	510:24	hemisphere	461:22
509:4	424:11	515:14	507:1	482:13
511:19	430:15	hearings	509 : 12	502:19
511:20	437:1	443:16	here's	
511:23	439:19	499:7	417:14	high-level
head	445:4		508:13	447:12
407:24	460:18	heart	He's 439:4	highlighte
	466:5	414:24	439:12	d 437:14
heading	469:7	439:15		highly
487:14	496:17	460:21	Hey 448:24	426:25
health	503:5	461:10	hi	499:18
415:24	505:4	467:24	449:24	
416:4	505:5	487:23	484:14	High-
416:10	510:15	505:1	489:16	Salt
416:23	510:20	513:20	501:21	409:18
420:11	513:22	heartfelt	high	431:25
436:2	heard	510:9	426:21	433:13
455:1	439:17	513:22	437:14	436:18
456:11	439:17	heaving	440:4	471:16
456:16	443:17	486:1	447:3	501:12
461:23	444:14	hell 504:3	447:11	507:11
471:5	444:15	nerr 504:5	448:5	historical
478:18	444:16	Hello	450:23	426:8
479:24	447:6	499:23	474:13	472:5
480:10	469:9	511:14	478:14	473:24
481:15	469:9	help	485:10	474:3
483:3	469:11	463:15	500:23	history
483:9	475:18	498:14	503:8	421:21
490:4	485:25	499:11	516:2	466:10
492:3	486:8	499:12	516:20	466:13
501:7	508:2	514:19	high-end	504:6
503:20	510:2	helpful	486:24	hold 431:2
505:16	514:21	410:16		468:15
healthcare	hearing	488:19	higher	474:14
483:4	436:13	488:19	449:15	480:20
hear	436:17		450:3	
407:13	436:19	helping	450 : 14	holding

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 544
418:24	hospital	500:9	491:3	439:7
434:16	509:8	500:25	506:23	445:5
494:18	hot 482:15	501:7	508:25	445:14
hole		505:16	509:19	445:24
472:20	hotels	512:17	ideally	446:4
487:1	410:10	hundred	426:11	447:12
holes	hottest	416:16	461:24	449:25
448:16	509:11	416:16	identified	453:21
1000	house	491:7	422:10	457:9
holocaust	489:21	hundreds	436:1	459:4
499:4	housekeepi	425:5		459:14
home		493:18	ignorant	460:23
507:18	ng 410:2	516:9	502:2	461:1
511:23	housing	[20 mg - 40 mg - 20 mg	II	462:4
513:19	486:21	hurt 505:1	486:14	462:18
homeowners	486:25	husband	504:3	463:21
500:5	487:4	499:24	I'11 408:3	466:9
	How's	hush 407:7	412:4	466:25
honest	424:12		412:5	467:4 467:8
511:18	huge		423:15	467:8
honestly	425:21	I'd 408:14	428:11	467:18
469:13	441:19	435:23	433:19	468:3
509:16	498:6	463:3	435:19	473:21
honor	498:24	464:4	449:2	481:1
511:1	498:25	487:20	449:22	481:2
hope	501:13	488:6	450:1	481:8
411:17	human	490:2	463:3	484:14
417:12	415:24	490:10	469:6	487:9
438:25	416:4	492:13	illegally	487:18
463:11	416:10	492:25	514:13	488:5
504:25	416:22	494:13	I'm	488:9
509:9	420:11	501:6	408:1	489:16
hopeful	436:2	idea	417:12	489:16
457:13	455:1	425:10	417.12	490:12
463:21	456:11	428:10	418:20	490:14
500:22	461:23	440:8	421:10	491:9
	471:5	440:21	424:8	491:17
hopefully	478:17	440:21	436:23	492:11
418:20	479:24	442:4	438:8	492:11
480:14	480:10	443:21	439:5	494:4

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 545
494:6	438:15	484:18	incredibly	е
495:1	478:21	importing	516:10	503:8
495:2	immoral	445:15	indeed	512:14
496:9	493:15	impossible	515:18	infinitum
497:12	493:21	483:11	indicates	456 : 1
499:7	495:19	483:21	478:22	informatio
499:23	impact			n
500:5	436:11	impression	indication	421 : 8
501:4	446:17	448:10	s 420:23	
501:11	470:5	inability	434:23	421:16
501:23	471:9	490:19	individual	422:2
505:5	495:24	inaction	450:7	424:17 435:23
505:23		488:13	individual	462:10
505:24	impacts			473:16
505:24	501:17	inactive	ly	473:18
506:15	implement	502:2	469:17	473:18 474:9
507:16	456:7	inadequate	469:22	474:9
508:3	implementa	474 : 8	industrial	474:10
508:4	bility	494:7	415:18	474:11
508:25	423:24	include	455:15	
509:4	1000	433:15	456:21	474:24
509:7	implementa		456:23	479:13
509:22	tion	511 : 4	456:25	479:20
510:12	423:5	includes	458:10	497:6
510:20	implemente	413:18	458:12	499:7
510:25	d 426:12	472:11	458:17	502:5
511:15	427:11	including	461:1	508:6
511:18		422:9	461:4	508:7
517:4	important	442:19	461:7	512:10
imagine	408:21		463:3	informed
509:12	408:25	incomplete	475:18	482:7
513:21	411:13	505 : 7	484:5	inhabitant
imagining	411:15	increase	484:8	s 481:17
475 : 17	411:24	485:8	486:24	483:10
	415:6	increasing	493:4	
immediate	419:14	483:3	493:17	initially
507:11	419:21	incredible	industry	480:4
507:12	422:19		501:22	505:4
immediatel	431:23	442:22	502:14	inner
y 499:1	436:11	452:1	300	415:5
immobile	439:24	502 : 25	inexcusabl	415:11
THIRIODITE	441:9			

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 546
415:16	instabilit	internatio	431:11	419:21
415:19	y 459:25	nal	482:23	419:23
417:8	instance	509:13	issuance	419:24
418:2	420:14	intruder	435:15	419:25
418:15	460:15	457:3		420:2
424:21			issue	420:4
425:4	institutio	intrusion	435:7	420:6
454:24	nal	476:14	455:7	420:6
input	430:5	invalidate	499:12 499:12	420:20
412:14	477:11	s 443:3	499:12 512:4	421:24
422:18	477:12	inventor	512:4	422:19
435:1	integrate	502:7	513:13	422:20
436:6	499:8	502:12		423:25
436:13	integrity		issued	428:9
469:5	467:4	inventory	515:5	429:14
471:1	467:17	471 : 22	issues	430:2
474:4	496:20	invest	410:11	430:9
494:19	502:18	497:7	410:12	431:9
insane	intensity	invested	444:6	431:9 431:23
513:8	503:6	460:5	it's	431:23
513:8	- 100 Mg	investigat	408:21	432:3
insanity	intent	ion	411:15	432:23
494:20	502:19	421:20	412:16	438:3
	intentions	472 : 7	412:16	438:4
inside	512:18		412:19	439:18
498:19	interactio	involved	412:20	440:1
insight	n 438:13	490 : 22	412:21	440:2
454:1	interest	involvemen	412:22	440:2
insist	426:23	t 411:4	412:25	440:4
508:10	Section and the graphs and the section and the	iodine	413:25	441:9
in-situ	interested	516:6	414:24	441:19
430:21	436:12	isn't	415:17	441:19
430:21	436:16		415:19	441:22
	436:19	441:1 449:14	416:2	442:9
inspection	interestin	486:5	417:7	442:21
421:14	g 409:14	505:9	418:15	442:24
inspiratio	428:24		419:1	443:6
n 497:25	429:15	isolated	419:2	443:14
inspired	intern	460:20	419:3	444:19

Isolation



intern

489:16

inspired

498:17

(800) 528-3335 NaegeliReporting.com

419:13

419:16

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 547
446:9	468:16	503:18	425:13	John
446:21	469:18	504:7	428:11	449:23
446:24	471:19	506:2	433:8	449:25
447:12	471:21	506:6	447:9	487:18
447:24	472:18	507:20	450:6	487:18
447:25	472:18	508:24	451 : 4	488:4
451:7	472:19	510:7	471:13	Johnson
451:25	472:20	511:22	Jacob	460:23
452:2	472:20	511:22	511:14	460:23
452:14	473:15	512:13	511:14	492:2
452:24	474:5	512:21		492:11
453:5	474:17	512:24	Jan 483:17	492:11
453:6	477:12	513:8	483:17	
454:20	477:14	513:9	484:12	joined
455:25	477:17	514:17	Japan	439:7
456:10	477:25	514:21	484:22	440:16
457:4	478:3	515:5	495:9	July 407:3
457 : 8	478:5	515:5	498:17	450:19
457:10	478:6	515:9	Japanese	justificat
458:11	479:11	515 : 12	484:21	ion
458:18	483:1	517:5	498:22	443:5
459:16	484:7	IV 407:1	498:25	443:6
459:22	485:15	I've 408:1	Jeff	110.0
460:3	488:15	417:16		K
460:4	488:19	447:18	499:25	Karin
460:16	488:21	451:11	Jerry	465:9
461:9	488:22	458:23	513:20	480:22
461:10	488:23	468:9	job 420:12	481:2
462:12	489:24	475:18	473:20	
462:25	491:20	498:5	486:12	Katherine
462:25	493:15	504:6	501:8	504:22
464:8	493:19	504:12	501:11	504:22
465:10	495:19	506:1	509:8	Kathleen
465:18	495:23	510:2	509:9	505:22
465:19	496:1	510:24	512:19	505:22
465:20	498:24	510:24	512:19	Ken 407:23
466:7	498:25	010.21	512:20	411:2
466:9	499:3		Joel	450:17
467:1	499:5	J.D 410:20	501:21	470:21
468:1	499:16	410:25	501:21	482:6
468:7	502:13	424:19	001.21	
		コムオ・エジ		

Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	C File # 14250-4	Page 548
key	424:13	larger	429:25	454:1
441:5	435:16	430:25	447:18	490:11
442:1	470:13	largest	454:13	505:17
442:10	471:13	411:14	454:14	508:3
kids 490:5	471:21	418:6	455:7	513:24
504:24	472:5		455:8	leave
	lake	last	458:18	423:15
kinds	500:13	410:24	464:1	440:8
420:17		416:12	464:2	440:11
455:11	land	439:1	479:9	448:10
495:19	413:18	447:5	479:15	470:15
knew	415:20	449:22	505:5	484:4
447:16	417:2	450:19	505:8	487:11
Knight	417:7	450:19	Lawrence	493:25
481 : 8	430:7	498:16	458:7	500:16
481:8	454:21	499:19	200 420 420 420 F	511:24
	454:24	510:17	lay 498:7	512:24
knowledge	484:3	516:14	layer	
426:8	507:17	lasting	476:11	leaving
426:8	landfill	492:8	lead 449:1	437:10
471:23	444:7	lastly	455:18	437:21
472:6	448:15	412:13	489:2	440:22
474:12	448:23	412:13	1 San	510:13
known	448:24		leads	510:21
429:2	515:7	431:4	488:11	led 493:12
474:3	515:17	432:2	488:12	left-
485:9	landfills	432:10 434:13	leak	hand
486:15	515:16	434:13	515:18	424 : 22
			leaking	A PAGE A STOCK OF A STOCK
	landscape	late 465:4	414:15	legacies
11-mile	442:17	514:15	507:14	512:23
515:3	languages	later		legacy
	513:3	482:5	leaks	511:24
lack	large		429:13	511:25
488:12	434:15	laugh	learn	512:1
laid 441:5	434:15	509:14	498:25	512:2
442:23	437:22	Laura	learned	
443:8	440:22	498:4		legal
515:14		498:4	501:12	471:4
Laija	472:18 477:17	law 412:20	least	515:1
424:11	4 / / : 1 / 4 94 : 1 1	420:20	408:11	legends

494:11

424:11

Public N	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 549
492:5	499:9	515:18	483:12	475:21
less	514:8	515:21	491:18	log 474:16
421:24	516:2	liquid	499:1	474:16
421:24	leverage	409:4	499:25	
474:5	421:5	425:24	500:3	logs
483:8	463:14	426:15	504:23	421:22
492:23	lied	426:25	513:11	long 412:1
496:23	30 30 30 30 30 30	428:3	lived	416:9
497:3	499:16	431:19	459:7	416:9
502:6	life	434:17	481:15	418:25
let's	441:10	434:18	Livermore	419:12
410:17	489:4	514:24	The second secon	419:20
W 201 W 201 W 201 W	489:5	1000 100 100 100 1000	458 : 8	423:20
425:3 441:24	491:20	liquids 491 : 21	lives	424:6
	500:25		505:25	429:7
458:21	lifetime	list 449:7	living	437:17
463:12	495:14	514:3	412:25	440:2
463:17 466:5		listed	481:18	441:9
472:9	light	436:7	488:6	441:16
the time that the control of the con	415:5	listen	491:19	457:15
475:8 479:3	limit	15 200 2000 100 000		464:8
503:22	455:20	422:16	Lloyd	464:12
503:22	458:3	512 : 20	494:15	472:8
504:4	483:24	literally	494:23	479:16
	492:16	497:17	lobbying	483:20
letter	limitation	497:20	502:14	484:6
437:4	s 430:6	liters	local	485:3
438:24		516:9	439:3	495:24
450:19	limited	little	located	510:17
508:15	431:3			510:17
level	434:9	407:7	427:23	512:7
424:1	limiting	408:4	429:18 491:19	longer
447:3	510:4	408:15		456:11
447:12	line 448:3	408:24	516 : 7	456:15
448:5	458:7	409:23	location	longest
451:15	498:15	418:3 446:10	411:17	429:3
480:11		456:17	locations	459:7
503:8	linear	498:13	450 : 7	
516:1	478:3	508:14	locked	long-lived
levels	478:6		419:3	440:4
478:1	liner	live	110.0	long-

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 550
term	460:17	433:25	468:5	429:14
416:3	462:22	471:15	managing	429:17
416:25	465:25	lump	418:24	431:2
419:4	480:3	477:10		431:7
420:10	480:3	177.10	mandated	432:22
452:6	480:14		451:6	434:2
463:5	488:13	main	mantra	434:6
485:7	489:19	492:24	514:17	434:11
485:18	494:2		manufactur	434:17
508:8	498:5	maintain	ed	434:24
long-	498:8	432:15	486:15	437:11
time	502:5	434:8		446:6
494:25	506:1	436:14	manufactur	453:8
	508:15	438:19	ing	456:4
Loren	loud 445:8	maintained	502:10	456:4
486:11	469:11	485:16	map 452:10	470:23
486:11	500:1	maintainin	maps	474:22
lose	love 489:3		449:17	476:15
449:13		g 430:4	452:19	478:19
480:17	489:5	430:4		478:19
517:6	507:17	432:13	Marbet	478:20
lost 485:6	lovely	463:6	494:15	478:25
511:5	439:11	1000	494:23	479:25
	low	major	Margie	480:2
lot	427:3	470:7	491:17	480:2
414:1	431:10	475:25	491:17	480:11
414:2	470:18	majority	margin	494:3
418:11	485:21	471:15	491:12	materials
423:11	lowest	495:12		445:18
424:3	485:9	manage	mass	matrix
425:4	1900 May 190	414:24	451:23	435:14
426:4 426:23	low-	419:20	massage	
428:18	level		505:24	Matt
438:9	419:9	manageable	massive	443:18
442:10	448:21	419:19	442:23	468:5
442:10	449:4	425:8		matter
444:3	Low-Salt	managed	mastodon	427:17
450:5	409:9	446:20	442:18	460:21
450:5	426:14	manager	material	468:21
457:12	426:20	410:18	415:2	496:19
460:13	431:25	424:14	429:12	508:22
400:13		174.14		

may 469:22 meaning 410:4 464:24 502:18 469:23 481:24 439:20 465:3 mentioned 508:14 means 490:12 465:16 425:13 408:24 498:5 466:3 426:4 411:12 423:3 467:6 437:6 445:6 426:5 467:10 494:8 456:17 452:21 meets 467:25 mess 488: 475:24 490:21 443:24 468:14 496:14 480:23 501:12 meltdown 468:18 511:17 480:24 meant 442:4 469:25 513:7	Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 551
458:19 510:21 517:9 463:8 504:2 490:7 511:12 meetings 464:19 men 500:2 may 469:22 meaning 410:4 464:24 502:18 469:23 481:24 439:20 465:3 mentioned 508:14 means 490:12 466:3 425:13 508:16 408:24 498:5 466:3 426:4 411:12 423:3 506:15 467:6 437:6 411:12 423:3 506:18 467:10 494:8 445:6 426:5 467:13 501:9 456:17 452:21 443:24 468:14 496:14 480:23 501:12 meltdown 468:18 511:17 480:24 480:24 469:25 513:7	maximum	507:24	506:25	459:12	memory
490:7 511:12 meetings 464:19 men 500:2 may 469:22 meaning 410:4 464:24 502:18 469:23 481:24 439:20 465:3 mentioned 508:14 means 490:12 466:3 425:13 508:16 408:24 498:5 466:3 426:4 maybe 415:25 506:15 467:6 437:6 411:12 423:3 506:18 467:10 494:8 445:6 426:5 467:13 501:9 456:17 452:21 meets 467:25 mess 488:4 475:24 490:21 443:24 468:14 496:14 480:23 501:12 meltdown 468:18 511:17 480:24 meant 442:4 469:25 513:7	458:14	509:15	514:5	459:14	500:16
may 469:22 meaning 410:4 464:24 502:18 469:23 481:24 439:20 465:3 465:16 425:13 508:14 means 490:12 466:3 425:13 508:16 408:24 498:5 466:3 426:4 maybe 415:25 506:15 467:6 437:6 411:12 423:3 506:18 467:10 494:8 445:6 426:5 467:13 501:9 456:17 452:21 meets 467:25 mess 488:4 475:24 490:21 443:24 468:14 496:14 480:23 501:12 meltdown 468:18 511:17 480:24 meant 442:4 469:25 513:7	458:19	510:21	517:9	463:8	504:2
may 469:22 meaning 410:4 464:24 502:18 469:23 481:24 439:20 465:3 mentioned 508:14 means 490:12 466:3 425:13 508:16 408:24 498:5 466:7 426:4 maybe 415:25 506:15 467:6 437:6 411:12 423:3 506:18 467:10 494:8 445:6 426:5 467:13 501:9 456:17 452:21 meets 467:25 mess 488:4 475:24 490:21 443:24 468:14 496:14 480:23 501:12 meltdown 468:18 511:17 480:24 480:24 469:25 513:7	490:7	511:12	meetings	464:19	men 500:20
469:23 481:24 439:20 465:16 425:13 508:14 408:24 498:5 466:3 425:13 425:13 426:4 466:7 426:4 411:12 423:3 467:6 437:6 445:6 426:5 467:10 494:8 456:17 452:21 467:13 501:9 475:24 490:21 443:24 468:14 496:14 480:23 480:24 442:4 469:25 513:7	may 469:22	meaning	=		
508:14 means 490:12 466:3 425:13 508:16 408:24 498:5 466:3 426:4 maybe 415:25 506:15 467:6 437:6 411:12 423:3 510:25 467:10 494:8 445:6 426:5 467:13 501:9 456:17 452:21 meets 467:25 mess 488:4 475:24 490:21 443:24 468:14 496:14 480:23 501:12 meltdown 468:18 511:17 480:24 meant 442:4 469:25 513:7	469:23	481:24	439:20		mentioned
508:16 408:24 498:5 466:3 426:4 maybe 415:25 506:15 467:6 437:6 411:12 423:3 506:18 467:10 494:8 445:6 426:5 467:13 501:9 456:17 452:21 meets 467:25 mess 488:4 475:24 490:21 443:24 468:14 496:14 480:23 501:12 meltdown 468:18 511:17 480:24 meant 442:4 469:25 513:7	508:14	means	490:12	134 NOT 54 NOT 50 NOT	
maybe 415:25 506:15 467:6 437:6 411:12 423:3 506:18 467:10 494:8 445:6 426:5 467:13 501:9 456:17 452:21 43:24 468:14 496:14 480:23 501:12 42:4 469:25 513:7	508:16		498:5		
411:12	mawhe		506:15		
445:6 426:5 510:25 467:10 501:9 456:17 452:21 meets 467:25 mess 488:4 475:24 490:21 443:24 468:14 496:14 480:23 501:12 meltdown 468:18 511:17 480:24 meant 442:4 469:25 513:7			506:18		
456:17 475:24 480:23 480:24 Meets 467:25 467:25 468:14 496:14 501:12 Meltdown 468:18 469:25 513:7			510:25	120.00 - 10.00 - 10.00	
475:24 490:21 443:24 468:14 496:14 480:23 480:24 meant 442:4 469:25 513:7			meets	- 5.00 4.00 - 5.00 - 5.00 - 5.00	
480:23					mess 488:8
480:24 meant 442:4 469:25 513:7			1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 100		
442:4 409:23 513:7				200000000000000000000000000000000000000	1 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1
	488:17	1,000 to 100 to	442:4		513:7
member message		514:19	member		message
409.7 measured 407:10 470:10 408.9		measured	407:10		1
491:11 492:18 407:15 470:17 444:20		492:18	407:15		
410:23		moscuroc	410:23		
416:6			416:6		met 421:17
433:1			433:1		
mccormick mechanism 433.1 473:22 478:17			433:3		
443:18 430:20 435:13 473:24 metal	443:18		435:13		metal
McCormick 432:19 445:14 474:21 477:17	McCormick	432:19	445:14		477:17
468:5 media 445:24 475:1 meters	468:5	media	445:24		meters
mean 502:1 446:3 475:10 447:20	mean	502:1	446:3		447:20
446:6		meet	446:6		447:21
449:11			449:11		methods
451:14			451:14		Committee of the Commit
457.0			451:20		
452:9 Mexico			452:9		
453:5 451:11			453:5		
407:2 453:10 408:1			453:10		
453:21			453:21	130 300 100 - 100 - 100 - 100	482:24
410:3 455:6 mic 407:1			455:6		mic 407:10
455:21 435:11			455:21		435:11
459:17 456:9 500.22 Wichool			456:9		Michael
459:11 456:12			456:12	5000	
499:15 457:6 members 484:15					
482:6 458:23 439:7		482:6	458:23	439:7	101.10



(800) 528-3335 NaegeliReporting.com

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 552
microcurie	443:11	Missoula	474:22	500:12
s 485:23	446:14	442:15	479:2	508:22
microphone	459:19	462:20	479:4	508:23
436:22	460:16	mistake	479:5	monitor
445:7	473:1	487:25	479:6	417:21
445:9	497:2	501:13	modeling	417:24
445:13	497:6	South states States States and	448:24	420:20
487:11	mind	misunderst	452 : 10	420:21
	417:12	anding	452:16	456:7
microphone	481:5	467:21	452 : 21	monitored
S	491:11	mitigate	452:23	Secured Constitution of the Secure
481:1	517:5	446:14	453:2	420:5
487:13	mine 452:2	460:10	478:21	456:8
498:3	2.5 42.5 (2.5 (2.1)	463:20	503:6	456:10
middle	minimize	477:13	515:16	monitoring
419:7	419:14	mitigated	models	415:25
475 : 18	419:16	463:18		423:14
migratabil	473:2	According to the second	452:16	month
ity	minimizing	mitigation	452:23 478:23	411:12
490:16	473:16	510:15	488:20	months
	minimum	mobile	488:24	
migrated	Supremental Activities and Control of the Control o	459 : 8	490:16	508:19
516:23	453:13	469:18	512:11	Monument
migration	490:7	469:19		413:18
449:20	minute	482:8	moderate	moral
452:11	418:8	mobility	408:2	496:8
475:13	435:20	423:21	moderator	496:9
493:5	435:24	430:19	436:24	496:23
516:21	468:20	430:20	439:1	morally
miles	494:21	437:18	modernly	483:22
413:16	minutes	437:20	484:25	
419:2	428:13	462:8	- San and San and an and	mostly
419:17	436:24	468:23	moment	408:2
419:18	464:9	471 : 8	408:14	mothballed
482:3	480:17	486:9	money	414:11
488:21	480:21	mobilized	443:12	414:12
488:22	misleading	441:23	461:5	414:15
499:3	448:12	-200 200 Ave 24 200 Ave 3	473:13	mother
515:3		model	473:19	488:7
million	mission	452:13	493:7	489:4
1117 T T T O I I	4 36 .	171.11		100.1



436:1

million

(800) 528-3335 Naegeli Řeporting.com

497:18

Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 553
505:25	multiple	483:21	516:14	505:19
Mountain	418:22	484:3	Niles	509:20
413:20	418:23	neckdown	407:6	513:15
mouth	myself	412:7	407:11	516:18
467:14	495:1	417:10	407:13	517:4
492:5	498:7	negotiate	407:16	nirvana
492:10		446:20	407:24	462:2
	N		428:13	nitric
move	nagging	Neighborho	435:11	427:1
407:18	488:16	od	436:21	Andrews on the second
410:17	nanocuries	484:15	444:23	no-
438:15	440:3	nephew	447:9	action
441:2		511:5	451:3	434:22
441:6	nasty	nerve	453:20	non-profit
444:13	414:25	486:15	458:21	501:23
458:21 475:3	427:10	486:19	464:3	nor 492:8
483:6	National	486:20	464:22	
486:6	413:17	487:8	465:1	Northwest
486:22	450:20		465:11	439:15
492:18	450:22	news	465:18	481:12
507:21	Native	413:24	466:5	483:4 487:23
515:20	492:4	413:25 421:2	468:9	513:20
515:21		421 : 2	468:15	
516:7	natural	448:7	470:2	Northweste
1000	501:18		470:11	rn
moved	nature	newspaper	470:16	505:24
437:11	457:16	503:9	473:23	note
444:7	Naval	nice 419:1	475:3	415:16
507:22	449:3	467:7	475:7	423:15
movement		467:8	477:6 477:21	424:8
449:18	Navy	506:19	480:12	482:10
501:24	448:13 510:18	506:20	484:12	483:2
moving	210:18	night	486:10	notes
478:25	necessary	407:9	487:9	411:25
482:9	421:1	407:20	488:4	
488:20	423:2	416:12	491:16	nothing
488:23	434:3	464:25	493:24	426:5
488:24	472:16	465:2	498:1	430:4
504:17	473:14	498:16	499:22	485:1
516:10	474:6	499:19	501:20	485:14
	474:10	- 1990 - 1990 1990	001.0	486:19

Public Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011	NRC File # 14250-4	Page 554
-----------------------------	---------------	--------------------	----------

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 554
488:17	nal	486:18	ones	option
505:2	438:6	486:22	427:23	430:7
notice	478:9	487:7	428:23	508:9
418:15	478:14	okay	495:14	options
421:4	479:18	407:19	online	452:6
490:11	479:22	414:21	439:14	497:13
noticed	obviate	424:11	onsite	order
410:2	493:8	424:12	444:8	412:20
422:16	obviously	426:6	492:22	484:19
notified	490:14	428:15		504:1
410:4	500:24	433:13	open 429:2	
	Street Tree Tree Tree Peer, Suits	435:11	475:14	Oregon 407:24
nuclear	ocean	435:21	486:2	
419:8	506:9	449:21	opening	408:5 437:16
481:13	oceans	458:4	437:5	437:16
499:4	485:4	467:3	operable	436:23
501:14	odd 418:16	473:23	408:20	449:16
507:4	offer	475:24	412:11	450:3
nuclides	407:22	477:4	412:12	450:3
445:17	407:22	477:20	operationa	450:14
numerous	464:17	480:12	1 421:22	478:10
459:3	500:8	488:8		482:6
155.5		488:17	operations	482:18
0	office	488:18	423:11	487:19
objectives	410:20	488:22 500:3	432:6	492:13
501:2	446:12	505:19	432:8	494:24
	458:10	507:16	opinion	495:1
obligated	460:2	509:1	407:23	Orogonian
505:13	offices	509:9	461:2	Oregonian 483:15
obligation	501:11	509:9	500:20	
481:6	official	516:20	501:10	Oregon's
O'Brian	422:13	Section and the section of the secti	opportunit	407:25
511:14	offsite	old	y 464:13	436:25
511:15	449:19	428:3	464:20	451:2
		500:20	465:20	496:10
obscure	Oh	511 : 15		organic
486:15	465:10	older	opposed 465:21	516:24
observatio	507:7	472:6		organizati
n 437:24	514:22	one-half	opposition	on
observatio	Oil 486:16	441:10	509:3	431:24

Public Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27 2011	NRC File # 14250-4	Page 555
rubile ivity (VOL 4) Taken on	July 21, 2011	NIXC 1 116 # 14250-4	raye 333

Public i	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 555
organizati	407:25	410:11	paying	485:5
ons	overview	410:13	501:5	487:13
446:11	412:9	particular	501:11	488:16
organize	436:25	426:22	PCB's	490:8
413:5	ownership	477:15	515:24	491:1
organized	499:13	496:3	peace	491:6
431:18	499.19	502:12	491:10	491:15
	P	particular	THE SECOND SECOND	493:20
original	p.m	ly	Pearson	494:17
471:4	407:4	436:12	494:4	495:7 495:8
orphan	517:10	503:6	494:4	495:10
500:12		parties	penetrate	495:10
others	Pacific	422:24	430:12	496:21
441:18	481:11	490:22	pennies	498:7
ought	483:4 505:23		482:25	498:22
489 : 23	Secretary Comments	partners	people	499:6
	paddle	418:22	410:3	506:18
ours 417:9	442:21	435:6	422:20	508:15
417:9	page 458:5	partnershi	424:3	511:2
ourselves	503:9	p 502:15	426:23	511:3
416:13	paid	Pasco	439:12	511:3
496:7	502:25	476:17	439:23	511:8
outer	Paige	pass	442:7	513:3
415:4	481:1	429:10	444:4	513:4
415:7	481:8	497:23	445:3	513:19
415:10	481:8		445:11	514:5
outside	483:18	passed	449:1	per
437:4		514:10	457 : 15	418:8
438:24	pan 495:21	past	457:17	440:3
459:22	paper	481:14	458:16	457:24
493:5	435:4	484:21	461:23	458:2
outstandin	459:24	504:13	465:20	perceived
g 464:5	492:7	516:21	465:24	498:6
	paralysis	pathetic	468:6 475:4	percent
overarchin	488:12	502:16	475:4	471:16
g 412:17	parentheti	Paulson	480:18	471:18
overcome	cal	486:11	480:25	
489:2	483:2	486:11	481:15	percentage 445:19
oversight	parking	pay 485:5	482:10	
	Parking	F-1 100.0		percolate

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 556
428:8	517:5	418:20	plain	429:9
performing	personal	picocuries	414:5	429:10
431:6	467:4	457:24	486:15	429:10
		458:2	plan	431:11
period	perspectiv		422 : 13	432:7
408:10	e 409:13	picture		432:7
408:10	439:3	429:4	423:4	446:13
435:10	439:13	429:5	423:4	447:3
441:16	440:20	458:25	443:4	476:10
445:3	441:14	459:1	443:24	476:15
449:9	442:12	512:8	470:6	482:23
459:20	453:15	pictures	470:9	The second second second second
464:6	476:7	418:5	477:16	plants
464:10	478:5		477:24	498:20
464:17	495:23	piece	478:2	Plateau
466:1	511:24	473:1	501:1	410:19
480:16	perspectiv	pieces	503:7	414:6
484:9	es 473:3	498:19	505:9	414:23
493:1		Pilot	505:11	414:24
516:13	pesticides	431:11	508:8	415:7
516:14	486:18	482:23	509:4	415:10
periods	486:19	64	planet	417:14
474:17	486:21	pipe	491:18	417:15
	petroglyph	472:21	491:19	418:9
permanent	s 492:10	pipelines	498:23	431:16
455:19	1000	409:11	509:15	442:8
perpetuity	phone		planning	446:15
457:11	514:2	piping	446 : 23	448:17
461:12	514:4	429:13		471:10
161.13	physical	pitiful	485:2	178.23

pitiful

placed

places

509:3

509:10

484:21

492:22

410:10

410:14

441:18

503:3

516:8

Naegeli Reporting
"The Deposition Experts"

pick

picked

physical

477:4

physician

488:6

physicians

487:20

Physician'

502:23

s 487:19

461:13

474:22

485:16

504:19

509:24

510:21

511:7

454:7

510:8

489:23

516:19

person

(800) 528-3335 NaegeliReporting.com

485:8

485:13

489:7

501:18

417:5

471:4

483:7

plant

513:24

418:10

462:24

plans

478:23

483:12

493:4

playing

408:1

408:3

410:24

412:25

453:20

451:1

please

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 557
470:19	440:22	point	poor 491:9	potential
498:10	441:6	411:6	portion	452:11
508:25	441:20	412:10	434:1	potentiall
514:2	444:18	439:9	494:11	y 410:12
plot 433:6	451:22	439:21		507:21
_	453:16	445:25	Portland	
plow	454:4	446:2	407:22	pound
504:14	454:9	453:17	410:9	483:1
504:15	457:23	454:3	500:5	pounding
plume	461:6	462:16	503:11	472:21
478:24	462:8	463:10	504 : 23	pour
plumes	468:22	467:4	posed	472:23
415:13	469:10	469:16	427:15	
452:25	469:23	479:20	poses	poured
471:11	470:18	491:2	442:14	487 : 2
	471:7	492:24		precedent
plus	471:12	503:21	position	467:19
416:17	478:22	points	440:15	468:4
plutonium	481:19	490:2	440:16	precedents
409:8	481:20	494:6	445:18	421:21
409:8	481:23		487:21	
409:17	482:2	police	492:14	predominan
424:24	482:8	491:5	492:21	t
425:22	483:23	Policy	496:10	460:8
426:16	488:1	417:3	possibilit	460:9
427:5	490:16	political	y 432:13	preferably
429:9	491:13	503:24	491:14	490:11
429:22	492:14	Name of the second state o	508:1	
432:6	492:17	Pollet	possible	preferred
432:9	493:7	448:9		422:9
433:8	493:14	448:20	442:9	422:15
434:19	497:20	452:19	482:14	431:25
437:15	498:11	454:3	483:23	433:24
437:19	504:18	457:19	485:10	435:25
437:20	505:13	458:4	485:22	436:10
437:22	507:21	458:13	504:21	prepared
438:7	508:11	465:5	505:17	489:22
440:1	508:18	513:17	508:13	prepostero
440:8	516:10	513:20	516:21	us
440:14	516:21	516:20	possibly	493 : 16
440:19	516:22	Pom 499:20	499:8	
				prescripti

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 558
ve 455:2	450:18	438:9	479:9	n 418:17
presence	451:2	451:24	480:5	project
415:23	451:25	461:10	493:11	424:14
435:2	506:10	463:9	493:11	512:12
442:5	506:20	482:11	494:20	
456:15	511:18	492:7	498:9	projected
463:5	prevent	504:1	499:17	449:18
	415:13	511:6	502:10	projection
present	434:10	512:18	510:12	449:17
422:8	472:24	problem	processed	452:10
438:16		484:18	418:8	489:18
440:2	preventing	490:18	425:22	projection
482:25	475:12	514:14		s 485:19
485:11	prevents		processing	489:20
503:13	454:25	problems	425:21	
510:1	476:14	450:5	452 : 2	promise
presentati	previous	514:25	produce	483:11
on 411:3	467:20	procedural	415:1	484:6
439:23	478:24	439:9	459:4	promised
467:10		process	produced	481:11
presentati	Price	411:18	495:13	483:16
ons	449:24	421:11	495:13	484:11
444:25	449:25	421:13	1000	promises
453:23	primarily	423:6	production	510:8
500:7	424:24	423:16	481:19	1,000,000
	429:18	426:8	products	properly
presented	429:21	446:19	459:3	493:8
499:7	432:6	447:18	459:4	property
preserve	432:11	447:25	program	485:6
491:14	446:13	449:6	447:15	487:6
President	516:24	451 : 9	478:5	proposal
459:15	principle	456:6	498:16	422:12
481:8	443:20	459:6	499:19	438:22
501:23	5.55	461:14		430:22
	prior	462:16	programmat	440:8
President'	453:25	471 : 22	ic 463:1	440:0
s 459:10	454:2	472:5	progress	450:20
459:17	probably	472:8	418:6	489:20
pretty	417:2	473:9	418:11	489:20
429:21	421:3	474:12	422:5	505:1
444:19	438:3	474:19	progressio	
			F-09-00010	proposals



(800) 528-3335 NaegeliReporting.com



provides

493:20

501:6

(800) 528-3335 NaegeliReporting.com

452:6

460:15

470:3

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 560
475:7	487:16	506:6	ranges	463:17
476:3	490:1	507:1	434:6	realities
476:4	497:21	515:2	rare 511:6	455:11
477:21	498:1	515:6		
487:16	quickly	515:8	rather	reality
493:1	444:5	516:6	433:17	457:11
493:2	451:24	radionucli	491 : 8	realize
496:8	463:11	de 432:2	rational	446:10
496:9	470:20		461:2	462:13
questions	482:9	radionucli	493:2	realizing
410:7	509:2	des	Rattlesnak	454:19
412:3	quiet	414:13	e 413:20	really
417:11	407:15	415:13		409:2
435:21		459:6 460:9	reach	409:2
444:24	quite	460:9	413:17	409:13
445:2	437:12		417:6	420:5
445:11	459:5	476:22	427:8	420:3
446:5	478:5	505:14	482:4	422:20
449:11	503:5	508:11	485 : 23	422:21
449:21	quo 479:19	515:20	reaches	425:9
450:13	quote	radium	453:19	439:9
451:3	440:18	429:22	reaching	439:24
458:22		radius	453:16	439:25
458:24	quoted	506:9	reactor	440:4
461:15	459:22	rain 486:4	419:8	440:5
464:4				441:2
464:5	R	rainfall	reactors	443:7
464:7	radiation	503:6	414:12	444:5
464:20	457:24	raised	449:3	450 : 16
470:16	500:9	454:3	484:24	456:19
473:23	506:6	500:12	readiness	460:21
480:15	radioactiv	505:23	424:1	466:7
498:12	e 419:10	raises	real 443:5	466:24
quick	440:5	455:6	450:4	466:25
410:1	441:11		463:11	467:7
445:10	445:17	Raising	491:15	468:12
466:4	448:14	495:6		487:16
468:13	448:15	ran	realistic	489:1
468:16	448:22	457:2	464:6	494:6
468:17	459:4	457:2	realistica	494:22
469:25	472:24	509:15	11y	495:18

Public Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on July 27, 2011 NRC File # 14250-4 Page 56				
	Public Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011	NRC File # 14250-4	Page 561

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 561
497:4	reassuring	411:8	reevaluati	g 411:23
497:9	510:16	422:22	on 423:7	related
497:11	511:12	435:7	reference	446:21
497:11	recall	435:8	412:10	449:11
497:13	447:4	435:15	476:1	
498:8		435:17	481:21	relationsh
498:17	receive	455:4		ips
498:21	429:8	455:18	refrain	413:4
499:2	481:4	455:19	444:17	relative
499:8	received	455:19	refuge	449:16
502:16	409:4	455:23	475:17	485:24
504:5	422:11	456:2	refused	relatively
506:5	422:19	477:14	514:23	426:21
506:14	426:15	487:20	to the second se	444:12
506:19	recent	497:1	regard	450:23
506:21	502:7	497:12	454:3	
506:23		497:24	485:3	release
509:16	recently	recorder	485:17	463:13
510:14	449:9	435:3	regarded	502:5
510:16	472:7		440:10	released
511:10	472:11	recording	regarding	429:14
512:9	494:9	453:24	445:15	relied
516:9	reclaiming	465:6	484:18	481:16
realm	447:16	records		516:17
416:18	reclaims	421:14	regards	
reason	447:14	474:4	456:18	rely 497:7
410:15		recovering	478 : 8	remain
491:1	recognize	432:24	region	419:4
504:6	503:17	recreation	452:4	441:13
	511:1	417:5	481:15	441:16
reasonable	recognized	419:25	483:9	461:7
458:14	502:13	5000	506:10	493:4
458:15	recognizes	rectangle	register	504:19
458:19	503:1	419:1	509:3	remaining
461:8		recurring		409:16
483:19	recommenda	469:10	regulators	434:20
484:10	tions	reducing	409:7	461:21
489:23	418:18	500:22	513:22	
reasons	reconfigur		reiterate	remains
443:15	e 498:22	reduction	411:1	494:10
478:11	record	423:21	reiteratin	remarks

Public Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011	NRC File # 14250-4	Page 562

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 562
437:6	479:16	434:2	representa	420:7
remedial	509:23	434:18	tion	residentia
421:19	510:14	472:1	425:19	1 454:21
423:3	remedied	493:7	representa	455:16
472:7	449:13	493:22	tives	residues
remediate	remedy	495:9	497:17	486:7
418:1	421:1	504:14	501:3	8. 5. 35. apr. 4. 4. apr.
423:13	450:20	504:18 505:13	representi	resolution
434:3	450 : 25		ng 495:1	438:11
434:19	501:15	removed	_	resources
456:3	remember	488:2	request	419:20
476:9	441:9	492:18	490:10	461:19
479:7	482:5	492:21	requests	509:25
remediated	No. 200	removing	450:24	510:5
456:5	remind	434:21	require	respect
486:2	484:20	438:7	434:25	489:4
492:19	493:25	470:18	509:24	489:5
remediatin	501:3	495:7	required	502:19
100000	remobilize	500:23	429:24	512:19
g	438:21	repeatedly	431:8	responded
425:6 478:16	remote	443:19	431:9	464:14
479:23	497:9	rephrase	479:15	493:10
480:9	removal	468:20	480:7	response
100000	440:24			435:13
remediatio	451:17	report	requiremen	435:16
n	451:19	417:22	t 429:25	
419:6	482:14	reported	461:6 478:17	responses
420:25	485:9	502:1		435:19
422:4 422:18	487:24	reporter	requires	responsibi
422:10	488:3	465:5	462:23	lity
423:11	491:4	repositori	505 : 5	450:9
423:12	491:13	es 452:6	reservatio	487:19
429:20	510:6		n 481:13	490:22
430:9	remove	repository	495:22	490:23
434:25	430:8	448:6	Reserve	493:19
446:15	431:6	505:15	413:19	496:15
452:22	432:18	510 : 23	413:19	496:24
471:3	432:22	represent	residences	499:17
471:4	433:20	467:15	417:6	503:23
475 : 11	434:1	508:16	41/.0	513:9

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 563
responsibl	423:1	460:8	453:1	robot
e 495:15	423:6	461:21	453:4	497:9
503:12	423:7	461:23	453 : 6	robust
504:8	423:8	462:7	453:6	450:25
responsibl	450:21	462:22	453:12	
y 496:13	516:16	463:19	453:17	role 408:1
	reviewing	500:21	453:19	408:3
responsive	450:9	500:25	456:21	408:4
513:25		505:3	457 : 25	436:24
rest	revise	505:12	460:2	439:1
414:18	479:21	507:11	481:16	450:4
417:3	revisit	risk-based	481:21	room
460:10	462:24	419:22	481:23	407:13
504:19	463:25	462:6	490:5	407:16
restoratio	rhetorical	484:17	499:3	437:4
n 444:8	487:15	485:2	503:19	445:3
		485:7	506:7	457 : 18
restrict	Richland	495:3	507:14	465:4
487:25	410:19	495:25	riverbank	468:10
restrictiv	413:13 446:12	508:8	449:19	468:11
e 485:21	460:12	risks	Riverkeepe	480:17
rests		460:9	r	480:24
441:4	ridiculous	462:4	437:2	496:22
	493:9	462:14	437.2	496:23
result	504:20	463:25	439:6	501:20
417:22	511:22	476:4	439:16	517:6
437:20	right-hand		440:12	roots
491:3	424:23	river	460:24	476:10
resulted	431:17	413:13	492:12	Rosemere
429:13	rigorously	414:6 414:7		484:15
retrieve	501:15	414:7	Riverkeepe	rotational
515:23	rise 486:7	415:8	rs	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
515:24		415:14	487 : 22	448:1
517:2	risk 422:7	418:13	riverway	rough
retrieving	427:15	442:13	452 : 12	447:8
447:18	429:21	442:21	roads	RTD
100	432:8	442:25	447:24	430:8
returned	455:1	446:12	Rob	434:19
484:10	456:11	452:10	494:4	501:12
review	456:15	452:14	494:4	rule
417.23	457:5	102,11	494.4	Tule



(800) 528-3335 Naegeli Řeporting.com

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 564
441:10	472:18	438:11	463:4	484:5
run 427:17	472:19	satisfied	screen	489:21
457:1	472:20	475:5	428:20	510:9
	472:23		457:21	510:13
running	473:1	saving		seen 452:1
427:15	473:2	482:25	seasonal	488:13
427:19	474:8	500:21	486:3	502:6
437:17	samples	savings	Seattle	seismic
	420:25	501:2	453:25	485:25
S	453:11	saw 452:16	489:17	
sacrifices	472:11	459:10	second	sell
481:18	472:14	498:16	416:2	505:11
safe	472:16	scale	417:10	selling
416:23	472:17	1 Access -	432:12	505:3
482:16	473:9	470:14	435:22	
491:4	474:14	scenario	439:15	send 435:5
safely	474:15	457 : 3	440:9	506:9
505:14	474:16	458:19	460:6	sending
,	474:16	scenarios	477:21	447:19
safety	474:16	457 : 2	480:21	sense
456:11	507:19	458:15	483:18	408:17
481:15	sampling		515:15	408:21
483:9	423:9	scenes	secondly	417:20
salary	423:9	501 : 25		426:4
501:5	425:12	schedule	492:20	426:11
salmon		408:6	secret	432:3
490:5	437:25	science	514:16	
	438:6	416:18	secretary	sent
salt	471:23	416:19	509:8	431:12
426:22	472:3 472:10		920 22 32 32	450:19
437:15	472:10	scientific	seeds	508:15
452:2		490:15	502:20	sentence
470:19	474:12 474:24	scintillat	seeing	510:10
474:14	The state of the s	ion	437:25	separated
478:15	475:1	474:16	477:18	424:25
485:10	479:25	Scott	478:2	The second secon
500:24	satisfacto	439:12	493:25	separately
sample	rily		503:1	427:24
421:25	478:17	scouting	seem 467:7	separation
422:1	satisfacto	498:3		425:11
472:17	ry	screaming	seems	September
	-1		454:4	201201201

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 565
435:9	456:24	491:6	471:11	409:2
septic	shallow	shift	showing	426:7
428:3	426:21	464:16	418:5	426:11
serious	427:25	480:16	488:25	452:4
466:24	429:2	485:25	shown	460:3
482:22	429:20	shifts	488:20	469:9
	444:12	486:3		486:13
seriously	451:15		shows	simple
449:1	Shamans	shipments	413:15	428:8
469:8	499:10	447:22	418:23	444:19
Serres	shape	shipped	428 : 21 448 : 24	478:5
437:1	418:17	446:24		482:12
439:4	418:17	447:7	471:11 478:25	497:20
439:5	100	447:25	515:17	simpler
439:5	shaped	448:6		414:4
492:20	416:2	shipping	shrink	simplified
serve	419:13	448:4	413:22	425:19
411:6	shaping	shocked	414:11	
411:6	442:16	509:23	shrinking	simply
served	share		414:5	501:9
411:17	435:11	shores	sides	sincere
	499:24	484:22	476:21	467:9
session		short		496:19
494:8	shared	423:20	sign	single
sets	500:7	449:7	496:12	429:10
409:16	sheets	472:8	signage	singling
455:9	439:10	499:25	484:21	459:5
512:10	439:12	504:1	significan	100-100 to
setting	439:16	shorter	t 429:16	site
434:15	Shell	438:17	434:24	409:20
Settling	486:16	shot	452:3	411:20
432:1	486:18	458:25	454:21	412:18
434:14	486:22		significan	413:16
M. Conference of the Section of the	487:7	showed	tly	416:3
seven	She's	452:17	422 : 17	419:8
489:7	424:9	454:17	452:24	419:10
489:13	488:7	457:20		421:13
489:14	506:19	457:22	sign-in	422:5
several		458:8	439:16	423:8
416:15	shield	471:9	similar	423:9
		1		424:19



Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 566
429:7	480:9	425:5	460:22	428:16
431:9	482:1	425:5	461:20	428:18
432:5	482:4	425:12	469:7	437:6
432:10	483:6	425 : 17	470:19	459:18
434:9	483:20	425:18	471:11	469:1
434:22	484:5	426:3	471:15	478:3
437:15	485:21	426:6	471:16	skin
438:19	486:18	426:11	477:1	500:19
440:7	486:22	426:13	486:21	
440:11	486:24	426:15	487:3	slide
442:1	491:14	426:15	488:3	457:20
442:7	493:4	426:20	494:7	457:20
443:16	493:9	426:22	494:9	458 : 8
444:11	494:10	426:22	500:24	slides
450:5	500:4	426:23	501:1	431:14
451:23	507:1	427:4	501:9	458:6
452:1	510:2	427:18	501:13	sloppy
452:11	510:21	428:1	501:14	482:21
453:19	510:22	431:19	515:7	
454:10	sites	431:20	515:25	slowly
454:22	408:18	432:3	516:1	483:6
458:10	409:3	432:8	516:7	sludge
458:12	409:5	435:23	site's	434:18
459:11	409:8	436:13	455:15	sludge-
460:15	409:16	436:15	455:15	like
461:1	409:17	436:18	455:24	
461:3	409:19	437:12		434:17
461:4	411:19	437:14	sitting	small
461:7	412:9	437:23	416:13	425:7
461:7	416:1	438:8	515:5	488:7
469:17	416:1	438:11	situation	489:6
469:23	418:23	440:15	486:13	490:24
469:24	419:3	440:24	496:6	512:6
470:7	420:5	441:21	507:6	smaller
471:3	420:22	444:6	511:19	414:5
471:6	422:18	452 : 3	situations	426:10
471:8	423:13	452:20	457:1	sneak
474:25	424:15	454:5	512:12	466:16
477:13	424:18	454:12		
477:19	424:23	455 : 12	six	social
479:23	425:2	457:11	409:2	461:13
	120.2		428:13	

Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 567
487:19	sold	somewhere	506:24	spectrum
soil	486:17	439:18	source	433:12
425:13	486:22	515:10	452:18	spell
425:16	solid	son 505:25	speak	410:23
427:3	419:3	511:23	445:8	spend
427:11	422:2	Sophia	446:19	408:14
427:15	432:22	499:23	468:3	508:23
430:4	504:14	499:23	468:4	
430:14	515:2	500:3	468:6	Spending
431:1	solids		488:6	500:14
432:15	428:2	sorry	496:20	spill
432:16	428:4	417:13	498:2	506:7
432:19	486:1	425:8	506:18	spite
433:12		447:12	516:19	505:10
433:16	solution	459:14	speaker	
433:18	487:24	481:3	410:18	split
433:19	490:24	484:16	439:2	450:9
434:8	490:24	506:15	439:2	spoken
437:19	solve	517:4	506:20	505:20
438:13	484:19	sort	1000	spot
438:15	solvents	443:25	speakers	509:11
440:22	491:21	458:24	408:8	572
441:13	516:10	458:25	409:22	spots 482:15
444:13	somebody	470:6	speaking	482:15 482:20
444:18	445:12	477:3	435:22	
451:15	463:1	490:18	454:6	spread
457:24	468:1	497:9	495:2	442:19
475:13 476:12	489:24	497:14	specific	472:25
476:12		509:14	423:18	spreading
482:21	somehow	sorts	476:22	475:19
485:9	463:13	421:14	specifical	square
485:24	495:21	sound	-	413:16
486:4	497:2	483:24	ly	488:21
486:5	someone	sounded	412:11	
486:6	457:3	508:4	477:2 478:14	stabilizat
486:9	468:12		478:14	ion
490:17	475:22	sounds	480:9	510:16
491:22	514:1	444:9	496:25	stabilized
491:23	something'	473:22	497:8	414:15
515:3	s 420:24	475:3	497:24	stable
			137.24	

P	ublic Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 568
441:3	485:20	478:9	499:11	stored
449:4	492:2	495:1	steps	447:17
459:19	492:2	501:3	484:19	storm
459:23	495:6	510:13		501:22
460:5	515:22	stated	steward	502:24
471:12	standpoint	441:7	507:17	503:2
478:20	408:25		stewards	503:4
478:21	455:2	statement	499:13	
478:25	476:20	446:17	stewardshi	storms
504:19		471:10	p 498:15	503:1
staff	stands	497:21	499:8	story
492:20	435:25	states		512:11
	start	454:19	stick	straight
stand	445:12	479:6	408:6	The second secon
411:20	468:11	481:10	sticking	472:22
449:2	480:23	496:14	513:18	496:5
463:23	480:25	507:2		straightfo
467:4	481:1	static	stimulate	rward
506:18	487:14		466:9	444:20
512:14	492:12	488:23	stomach	strata
standard	514:7	stating	444:10	442:23
415:8	started	481:5	stones	
443:24	421:13	481:7	504:15	strategy
449:15	439:10	status	504:16	412:17
454:9	460:15	449:10		415:15
456:5	486:22	479:19	stood	stratifica
457:22	514:15	stay 412:1	443:18	tion
476:11		439:18	stop	472:23
484:9	state	439:18	420:18	street
485:22	407:24	The state of the s	449:19	486:24
514:8	407:25	465:2	452:10	487:4
standards	408:5	486:5	495:17	
	422:25	stays	495:18	stress
414:20	437:16	457:14	stopping	498:15
414:20	448:1	460:5	491:21	struck
415:10	449:15	steam		510:7
453:13	449:25	429:9	stops	structure
453:14	450:2		453:2	
454:4	450:11	steel-like	storage	433:21
454:18	456:18	477:3	447:15	490:18
458:8	458:18	step 408:3	491:4	structures
485:17	450 11			1

459:11

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 569
434:16	427:10	summer	surgical	470:22
student	substantia	407:8	483:14	470:24
491:9	1 470:18	407:20	surprise	471:2
students	470:19	Superfund	438:9	471:7
504:5	470:22	487:3		472:21
	471:17	support	surprises	480:2
studies	success	487:24	474 : 1	489:5
452:1	441:17	487:24	suspected	489:11
516:16		492:13	482:11	495:11
stuff	successful	492:13	sustain	511:11
414:25	441:18	502:6	489:22	talk
419:11	suffered	513:9	swaths	408:13
440:5	488:9		486:1	409:15
440:6	suffering	supporting		411:18
444:12	511:8	491:10	Sweden	412:11
449:14		supposed	500:11	412:13
460:17	sufficient	420:23	509:14	413:9
466:15	434:1	455:13	sweeping	414:22
466:17	504:12	503:2	442:16	415:16
466:18	505:8	sure	swim 490:5	416:17
466:19	suggest	416:22		418:2
466:20	465:12	420:10	sympathy	421:11
475:16	468:12	420:22	494:17	423:23
488:25	489:15	449:24	system	428:12
490:6	499:18	459:5	427:11	428:16
507:10	suggestion	463:5	427:16	428:17
507:14	s 509:7	469:13	427:16	431:24
515:20	300	487 : 1	428:3	432:12
subject	suggests	508:4	433:16	460:14
411:15	516:21	512:20	461:13	462:7
446:16	suicidal	514:2	462:4	463:17
447:23	504:24	surface	462:5	463:19
submit	sum 444:14	426:19	systems	467:19
459:16		430:19	417:18	471:15
	summarizes	430:10		472:9
submitted	419:15	438:19	Т	476:19
437:5	summary	438:21	table	477:20
submitting	435:14	515:16	418:20	478:15 496:6
510:25	435:16			506:21
substance	438:23	surges	taking	510:2
	497:21	491:20	411:16	310.2

(800) 528-3335 NaegeliReporting.com

Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 570
514:6	talks	463:21	terminolog	516:1
talked	413:7	463:22	y 500:6	Texas
411:22	507:10	476:21	terms	452:4
424:19	tall 447:4	476:25	409:24	thank
428:18	tank 419:5	501:25	443:25	407:8
431:15		502:15	445:8	407:19
432:17	428:4	502:23	450 : 12	411:16
450:6	432:1 434:14	technology	458 : 7	436:20
456:5	434:14	421:4	499:14	436:21
461:19	434:20	424:1	505:8	444:21
470:17	446:14	424:2	514:6	483:1
470:23	100	496:3	terrible	484:12
478:13	tanks	497:7	509 : 19	488:4
489:17	409:12	498:14	509:19	489:15
talking	428:2	500:7		491:16
408:18	434:15	502:8	test	493:22
409:1	446:16	510:3	436:22	493:24
409:25	446:21	510:7	tested	494:14
411:11	447:8	temporaril	494:9	497:25
411:12	460:18	y 447:17	494:11	499:22
412:8	task 501:6	_	494:12	501:19
415:21	tasks	ten	testimony	504:9
416:19	489:11	442:2	513:22	504:21
424:10		443:12	513:22	505:17
424:16	taxpayer	510:4		509:1
435:9	491:8	tens	testing	509:19
440:1	491:8	441:21	476:23	509:20
441:12	teams	442:9	482:14	511:12
445:22	448:2	443:1	494:7	513:14
448:16	448:2	493:18	tests	513:17
453:18	technetium	term	497:3	513:25
461:17	516:6	418:25	tetrachlor	517:2
466:17	technical	419:20	ide	517:6
474:13	450:16	423:20	427 : 1	Thanks
480:6	450:16	423:20	427:6	484:12
480:8	Name of the Party	424:6	427:9	486:9
493:13	technique	430:21	427:20	486:10
506:25	432:23	457 : 15	432:10	499:21
508:20	technologi	479:16	432:21	
515:17	es	485:3	432:25	that's
	463:14		453:12	408:2

 ${\bf (800)~528\text{-}3335} \\ {\bf NaegeliReporting.com}$

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 571
408:11	436:6	464:2	507:12	429:16
409:15	436:7	464:11	507:18	434:24
409:23	438:22	464:11	508:2	438:24
411:20	439:24	465:6	510:20	444:17
411:21	439:25	466:4	510:23	445:12
413:19	440:19	466:25	513:8	446:1
413:24	441:10	469:5	513:12	446:9
414:23	441:14	469:11	513:13	446:10
415:6	442:3	470:21	theater	446:11
415:15	442:9	470:25	500:11	446:19
416:11	443:7	470:25		447:5
416:24	443:11	471 : 1	theme	450:4
417:22	443:14	471:16	469:10	450:8
417:24	443:21	471:17	therapist	450:8
418:19	443:21	472:1	505:24	452:3
419:13	444:13	472:8	thereby	455:20
419:18	444:17	472:13	491:22	456:15
419:19	444:25	475:5	V-199	462:13
420:5	446:8	475:14	therefore	462:22
420:12	446:17	476:18	483:22	466:22
420:12	447:7	476:20	485:8	477:3
421:2	448:17	477:12	there's	477:16
421:9	448:23	479:1	409:1	479:5
421:20	449:14	479:2	409:5	491:20
422:19	450:11	479:9	409:7	494:2
422:22	450:21	480:6	409:10	503:24
424:5	450:21	483:21	409:11	506:21
425:21	451:1	485:22	410:8	they're
427:4	451:13	486:6	410:11	414:15
427:8	452:22	490:20	410:12	420:22
429:7	453:4	492:24	410:13	430:11
429:25	454:23	497:5	417:5	443:8
430:7	455:22	497:18	417:14	447:20
430:17	457:16	497:18	418:22	447:20
431:2	458:3	499:2	418:23	449:4
431:24	458:18	503:7	420:7	454:17
432:24	459:25	504:7	420:25	454:19
433:12	460:5	506:11	426:24	469:9
434:11	460:22	507:6	428:16	473:12
435:10	463:19	507:11	428:19	474:7
435:21	464:1	507:11	429:4	497:22

Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 572
498:20	three-	409:1	486:16	427:2
498:23	dimensio	409:22	487 : 7	427:6
499:20	nal	409:25	total	traveled
they've	476:20	411:7	413:15	427:25
429:6	488:20	411:17	426:24	The second of the second of
443:8	threshold	411:24	450:8	travesty 495:23
460:20	421:18	421:8	485:6	
513:23	423:16	422:8	totally	treat
thin		422:21	490:20	417:17
488:15	thrilling	423:23		417:18
488:16	489:1	424:10	touch	423:14
	throughout	424:16	449:5	430:8
third	417:18	425:12	towards	431:7
452 : 8	506:10	435:1	450:24	432:18
thorough	thumb	435:4	510:5	434:2
443:22	441:10	436:1 461:11	town 481:9	440:24
503:14	Thus 496:7	469:9		487:24
504:20	A. Marie C.	500:8	toxic	493:7
504:21	tight	501:12	491:25	treaties
505:9	445:3	505:11	toxicity	484:7
thousand	tiny	513:18	423:21	treating
416:14	500:20	513:23	track	418:12
thousands	today	514:1	492:24	515:9
425:24	422:14	514:7	tracking	treatment
441:22	447:15	tonights	497:22	418:7
442:2	453:9	446:9		423:22
442:9	463:24		tragic	432:7
443:2	476:23	top 433:23	485:6	447:3
447:21	483:15	434:4	transparen	482:15
458:17	toilet	461:23	су	514:24
493:18	428:4	467:23	467:24	tremendous
493:18	Tom 504:10	472:20	transport	ly
516:9		476:5	514:18	488:10
threat	504:10	476:6	transurani	200
438:16	tomorrow	476:11	C	trench
442:14	479:3	topic	440:5	474:13
481:22	tonight	411:25	440:11	trenches
threats	408:1	topsoil		426:2
483:3	408:13	482:21	travel	429:19
400.0	408:18	Torrance	426:17	429:19

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 573
431:21	447:13	420:13	469:19	unconscion
449:13	447:14	421:16	502:14	able
472:10	447:16	430:1	514:12	482:22
494:12	448:4	436:5	types	uncontroll
515:3	truck	445:14	430:11	
tribal	507:4	453:21	460:19	able
457:2		454 : 18		496:6
489:14	truckloads	461:16	typical	undergroun
511:3	448:14	465:21	429:7	d 475:12
	509:5	465:22	typically	475:20
tribes	515:6	466:23	431:3	475:25
484:4	true	473:10	476:11	477:8
484:7	468:24	475:23	200	515:10
484:10	trust	484:18	U	understand
Tri-Cities	467:2	506:15	U.S 410:19	408:22
413:13	467:3	508:17	437:16	411:5
tried	508:21	512:11	438:18	413:6
419:16	508:21	513:3	440:13	421 : 12
421:15	514:22	tsunami	450:10	431:23
466:16	515:20	484:23	450:20	452 : 2
509:16		1000 See 100	486:14	452 : 15
100 000 000 000 000	try	tube	487:8	454:10
trillion	408:6	472:18	493:3	465:24
461:25	408:8	tumbleweed	493:6	466:25
Tri-	408:12	476:16	502:3	484 : 18
Parties	408:17	turn	502:21	490:20
422:24	410:9	407:18	514:23	494:17
437:5	412:2	407:21	ultimately	498:8
437:9	412:5	421:10	419:2	511:10
480:13	415:7	424:8	468:25	511:12
Tri-	415:9	480:22	473:18	512:7
party	415:11	490:13	501:5	understand
435:6	419:13	turns		ing
	421:7 421:25	423 : 2	unacceptab	445:1
TRU 431:12	461:22	476:16	le	495:11
439:24	480:20	1000	482:17	
439:25		twelve	uncertaint	understood
440:5	trying	443:13	y 450:24	468:21
446:24	413:7	type	uncle	509:18
447:6	414:19	456:20	511:4	underway
447:10	418:12	456:25))) 11:4	446:17
447:11		The State State Street State S		

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 574
undulation	unless		491:20	vitrify
486:4	468:12	V	versus	446:7
unexpected	unmitigate	vacuum	458:9	voice
516:20	d 452:21	432:20	476:2	445:6
516:22	unreasonab	433:5 433:7	477:23	volume
516:23	le 484:8		viable	407:1
unforeseen	505:7	valid	416:20	423:21
495:25	1000	469:5	441:22	448:20
unfortunat	unrestrict ed	Vancouver	481:17	volumes
ely	456:20	484:16	485:15	496:20
494:20		491:17	vibrant	130.20
495:5	unsafe	504:23	504:17	
502:3	501:14	vapor	view 411:5	wait
unhappy	untreated	427:11	437:19	427:13
467:1	514:11	427:16	442:13	475:24
	upcoming	432:19	views	508:24
uninhabita	497:1	432:21	499:24	509:1
ble	update	433:16		waiting
485:4 506:11	446:22	516:2	violated	499:4
The same of the sa	508:6	variabilit	484:6	516:19
unique	updates	y 454:11	violation	walk 429:1
418:16	446:4	454:16	484:5	449:5
427:5 516:24		455:8	virtually	
I Particular of Market (M. Construction of Con	upon 516:17	455:9 455:14	492:19	War 425:23 486:14
unit			visualizat	504:3
412:11	uranium	variables	ion	504:4
United	459:3	496:17	512:6	
481:10	474:13	varied	visualizin	warnings 484:23
496:14	urge 508:9	454:5	g 498:12	
507:2	usage	variety	vitrificat	Washington
units	454:21	453:22	ion	419:9
408:20	useful	various	430:21	422 : 25 442 : 17
412:12	444:11	438:13	430:21	442:17
425:7	usually	490:15	446:13	442:19
university	428:6	vast	447:2	449:15
468:11	473:12	481:12	510:3	449:25
unknowns	479:23	486:1	vitrified	450:2
495:24		veins	446:23	450:12
		ACTIID	770.20	

Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 575
450:18	424:23	439:25	482:23	429:8
456:19	425:5	440:5	483:8	430:12
458:18	425:17	440:6	492:21	430:17
491:18	425:18	440:8	493:8	453:14
500:4	425:24	440:11	493:20	481:17
504:23	425:25	440:14	493:22	501:22
505:5	426:3	440:15	495:12	502:24
505:6	426:6	440:24	497:8	507:12
505:8	426:10	440:25	500:4	514:11
505:12	426:11	441:11	500:23	514:11
508:10	426:13	441:12	501:14	515:1
Washington	426:15	442:14	507:4	515:22
's	426:15	445:16	514:11	ways 512:4
515:25	426:17	445:25	514:18	_
	426:25	446:1	514:24	weapon-
wasn't	427:4	446:14	515:2	grade
414:1	427:22	446:22	515:6	415:2
429:11	427:23	447:2	515:8	weapons
480:7	427:25	447:3	515:12	415:1
waste	428:3	447:7	515:15	462:1
408:18	429:7	447:8	wastes	wearing
409:2	431:10	447:10	427:18	488:15
409:4	431:10	447:12	485:10	488:16
409:5	431:12	447:12	492:14	1000 1000 1000 1000 1000
409:9	431:19	447:13	495:15	we'd 410:5
409:16	431:21	447:14	496:11	444:23
409:17	433:13	447:16	516:25	444:25
409:18	433:25	447:25	Watch	Wednesday
409:18	434:5	448:5	481:9	407:3
409:19	434:9	448:10		week 442:4
409:20	434:14	448:12	watched	5000
411:19	434:22	448:13	453:24	weekend
411:20	434:23	448:15	water	500:13
414:1	436:15	448:22	411:19	500:14
418:24	437:6	449:4	414:19	weeks
418:24	437:13	450 : 7	415:10	411:12
419:3	437:14	455:12	415:14	weighed
419:10	437:15	457:4	418:12	444:16
424:15	437:22	469:17	423:13	
424:18	438:8	482:15	428:5	weighing
424:20	439:24	482:22	428:7	444:4

Public I	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NRC	File # 14250-4	Page 576
welcome	we're	421:17	469:20	we've
502:13	407:19	422:8	470:22	408:6
welfare	408:6	423:22	470:24	411:14
501:7	408:11	424:10	471:6	411:22
	408:17	424:20	473:7	414:12
we'll	408:23	425:16	473 : 7	416:12
411:8	409:1	426:2	473:10	418:18
411:9	409:24	428:16	474:13	422:10
412:1	411:4	428:17	475 : 4	425:11
412:13	411:8	430:1	478:16	435:2
414:9	411:11	433:25	479:11	436:3
414:10	411:11	434:7	480:2	444:24
414:17	411:18	434:11	480:6	447:14
414:22	411:23	434:20	480:9	463:4
415:11	412:8	436:5	480:20	465:22
415:16	412:10	436:12	488:22	465:23
417:19	412:21	436:19	493:24	468:9
417:21	413:6	437:1	495:11	469:8
420:15	413:23	437:7	496:3	469:9
421:4	414:18	439:25	496:7	469:11
431:24	414:19	440:20	503:25	474:14
432:11	415:7	441:11	506:25	475:7
435:3	415:9	447:18	507:7	480:12
435:4	415:12	448:16	507 : 8	480:17
435:5	415:20	450:15	509:23	480:25
435:7	415:25	456:3	510:4	496:8
435:20	416:8	458:2	512 : 6	499:16
436:21	416:9	459:21	512:15	502:6
437:2	416:13	459:23	513:2	503:1
444:20	416:19	459:25	513:2	504:8
445:8	416:22	460:6	513:6	511:20
455:3	417:10	461:11	513:25	514:20
455:18	418:6	461:16	517:6	516:19
456:7	418:11	461:19	West	whatever
469:12	418:11	463:14	424:21	410:14
473:11	419:4	464:11	424:24	441:24
491:5	419:11	464:22	431:16	468:23
514:22	420:10	465:3	Western	488:2
well-	420:12	465:21	507:1	504:6
suited	421:9	469:12	507:1	whereas



440:24

421:16

(800) 528-3335 NaegeliReporting.com

509:11

whereas

Public	Mtg (VOL 4) Taken on	July 27, 2011 NR	RC File # 14250-4	Page 577
480:7	wise	454:20	510:18	426:18
wherein	423:25	workers	you'er	zero 412:8
421:12	424:5	434:10	512:17	Zillah
Whereupon	wisely	458:17	you'll	500:3
517:9	473:13	working	409:14	zillion
whether	wish	467:12	416:1	498:12
416:20	419:17	467:18	417:1	
417:25	509:7	473:25	417:9	zone
423:18	woman	works	429:20	482:17
423:24	466:6	459:6	430:15	493:17
423:25	487:10	world	435:2	
440:10	498:13	10-4 -0.5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	438:25	
458:14		418:7	young	
468:21	women	486:14	498:18	
White	502:18	504:3 511:16	500:10	
442:20	wondering	211:10	your'e	
	461:1	worse	512:11	
whole	work	514:14		
413:15	407:24	514:25	yourself	
417:18	410:14	worth	460:7	
423:8	413:9	500:21	507:25	
450:7	424:13	writing	youtube	
507:2	450:10	410:16	453:25	
wide 447:5	450:16	439:14	you've	
wildlife	467:16		413:2	
417:4	467:17	wrong	428:13	
420:1	476:22	420:24	469:21	
475:17	477:1	508:3	480:14	
willing	479:14		484:1	
438:22	494:23	<u>Y</u>		
	501:22	yellow		
WIPP	502:20	414:8	Z-9 470:23	
431:10	502:24	414:20	474:13	
447:19	504:23	414:21		
447:23	512:5	yet	Z-9's	
449:12	512:7	448:5	472:10	
451:6	worked	449:7	Z-	
451:23	486:16	495:24	Ditches	
WIPP'S	worker	505:20	409:6	

451:25